

City-Wide Exclusive Franchise System for Municipal Solid Waste Collection and Handling

SCH# 2013021052



Prepared by
Bureau of Sanitation



Solid Resources Citywide Recycling Division

Enrique C. Zaldivar, Director
Alexander E. Helou, Assistant Director
Karen A. Coca, Division Manager
Daniel K. Meyers, Assistant Division Manager

March 2014

This page intentionally left blank.

**CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

**CITY-WIDE EXCLUSIVE FRANCHISE SYSTEM for
MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE COLLECTION
and HANDLING PROGRAM**

SCH #2013021052

PREPARED BY:

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
BUREAU OF SANITATION
1149 SOUTH BROADWAY STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015**

PREPARED WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF:

**CH2M HILL ENGINEERS, INC.
1000 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SUITE 2100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017**

MARCH 2014

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <i>SECTION</i> | <i>PAGE</i> |
|--|-------------|
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1-1 |
| 2 FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS..... | 2-1 |
| 3 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT | 3-1 |
| 4 COMPREHENSIVE FINDINGS OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS..... | 4-1 |
| 5 ALTERNATIVES | 5-1 |

TABLES

| | |
|--|------|
| Table 4.1-1 Summary of Impacts to Aesthetic Resources | 4-2 |
| Table 4.2-1 Summary of Impacts to Agricultural Resources | 4-5 |
| Table 4.3-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Air Quality | 4-9 |
| Table 4.4-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Biological Resources..... | 4-15 |
| Table 4.5-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Cultural Resources | 4-21 |
| Table 4.6-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Geology and Soils..... | 4-24 |
| Table 4.7-1 Summary of Greenhouse Gas Impacts..... | 4-30 |
| Table 4.8-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials..... | 4-32 |
| Table 4.9-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Hydrology and Water Quality | 4-38 |
| Table 4.10-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Land Use | 4-45 |
| Table 4.11-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Mineral Resources..... | 4-49 |
| Table 4.12-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Noise..... | 4-51 |
| Table 4.13-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Population and Housing..... | 4-57 |
| Table 4.14-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Public Services | 4-60 |
| Table 4.15-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Recreation | 4-63 |
| Table 4.16-1 Summary of Impacts to Transportation and Traffic Resources..... | 4-66 |
| Table 4.17-1 Summary of Impacts Related to Utilities | 4-71 |

Table 5-1 Forecast 2030 VMT and VHT5-1

Table 5-2 Environmental Issue Areas5-3

Table 5-3 Comparison of Environmental Issue Areas by Alternative5-4

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

This Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations provides the findings of environmental impacts of the *Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR) for the Citywide Exclusive Franchise System for Solid Resources Collection and Handling* program (City of Los Angeles 2014, SCH No. 2013021052) and presents the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Proposed Project. The Program EIR consists of the Draft Program EIR and the Final Program EIR.

Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines require a public agency, prior to approving a project, to identify significant impacts of the project and make one or more written findings for each such impact. According to Section 21081, "no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:

- (a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:
 - 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
 - 2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
 - 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

- (b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment."

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 2

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 FINDING REGARDING MODIFICATIONS TO THE PROGRAM EIR

The Los Angeles City Council finds that all information added to the Program EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft Program EIR for public review, and information added to the Program EIR in response to written public comments received on the Draft Program EIR but before certification, provides clarifying language, addresses minor inconsistencies, or makes other minor modifications to an adequate Program EIR. No significant new information, as described in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, has been added to the EIR after public notice was given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under but before certification; therefore, the City Council finds that the Program EIR does not require recirculation.

After careful consideration of the Program EIR and the input of agencies and the public, the Los Angeles City Council recognizes that disagreements among experts remain with respect to issues identified in the Program EIR. Main points of disagreements include how the solid resources diversion and program goals are implemented, or how the diversion goals will be achieved by the various alternatives. These disagreements are addressed in detail in response to comments in the Final Program EIR. Based on the whole of the record and findings of facts, the Los Angeles City Council finds that substantial evidence in the record supports the conclusions in the Program EIR.

2.2 KEY FINDINGS OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

As discussed below, it has been found that the Proposed Project would result in certain unavoidable significant adverse impacts after mitigation. For each unavoidable significant adverse impact, one of the following Findings shall be made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The Proposed Project would result in the following unavoidable significant adverse impacts after mitigation:

Air Quality

1. Criteria pollutants produced during construction of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could exceed the thresholds for significance established by the SCAQMD.
2. Criteria pollutants produced during operation of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could exceed the thresholds for significance established by the SCAQMD.
3. Construction and/or operation of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
4. Criteria pollutants produced during construction and/or operation of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could, in conjunction with other related projects, could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative air quality impact.

Cultural Resources (Historic Resources)

5. New or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could result in significant impacts to historical resources (if present at the future facility site) because there is a potential that such resources could be demolished or altered.
6. New or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could result in significant cumulative impacts to historical resources (if present at the future facility site) because there is a potential that such resources could be demolished or altered.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

7. The incremental residual GHG emissions from new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would make a cumulative contribution to global climate change, which is considered potentially significant and unavoidable.

Transportation

8. New or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could result in traffic that results in localized impacts to the road network, which may conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.
9. New or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could result in traffic that results in localized impacts to the road network, which may conflict with a congestion management plan.

10. New or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could result in traffic that contributes to or results in a significant cumulative traffic impacts.

Section 4 below provides the comprehensive findings made by the Los Angeles City Council, which also include the key findings above. Section 4 also provides the rationale for that support the findings.

2.3 KEY FINDINGS OF ALTERNATIVES

The No Project alternative would not meet the basic Project Goals and is rejected.

Alternative 1- Non-Exclusive System would meet most of the Project Goals, but is slightly less efficient, and does not reduce any of the significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project is preferred over Alternative 1.

Alternative 2 - Exclusive System with Multiple Franchise haulers per Wasteshed would meet most of the Project Goals, but is slightly less efficient, and does not reduce any of the significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project is preferred over Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 - City Collection of Solid Resources would meet the Project Goals, but does not reduce any of the significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project. Further, this alternative would require considerable capital expenditure to acquire a new fleet of collection vehicles and support infrastructure. Therefore, the Proposed Project is preferred over Alternative 3.

Section 5 below makes findings regarding the impacts associated with the Project Alternatives that were evaluated in the Program EIR, and provides the rationale for why the Proposed Project is the preferred alternative. The Proposed Project is also the environmentally superior alternative.

2.4 FINDINGS REGARDING NEW FACILITIES

The expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards could be located within the City of Los Angeles or in another jurisdiction. The Los Angeles City Council finds that:

- For future facilities within the City of Los Angeles, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR.
- For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

2.5 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Los Angeles City Council hereby certifies that the Program EIR (Final and Draft Program EIRs) for the Citywide Exclusive Franchise System for Solid Resources Collection and Handling program has been completed in compliance with CEQA, and finds that the Program EIR reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis, that the Program EIR was presented to the Los Angeles City Council (decision making body of the Lead Agency), and that the City Council has reviewed and considered the information in the Program EIR before approving the Proposed Project.

Based on the benefits listed below, the Los Angeles City Council hereby concludes that the Project's benefits outweigh and override the Project's unavoidable significant impacts for the reasons stated below. The City Council reached this decision after having accomplishing all of the following: (1) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (2) rejected other Project Alternatives, (3) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts associated with the staff-recommended Proposed Project, and (4) balanced the benefits of the Project against its impacts that would be significant and unavoidable. These overriding considerations justify certification of the Program EIR and approval of the Proposed Project.

1. The Proposed Project will help the City meet state-mandated goals to divert solid wastes away from landfill disposal, and meet further diversion objective under its Zero waste goals. The Proposed Project will provide the benefit of extending existing landfill capacity, and minimizing capacity impacts on new landfills that could service the City in the future. Maximizing the preservation of existing and future landfill capacity is of the utmost importance in terms of sustainability and livability within the City of Los Angeles.
2. As part of the Proposed Project, the City will increase the amount of Organics diverted from landfill disposal, which would likely have the added benefit of reducing the potential for landfills to generate methane and other greenhouse gas emissions.
3. The Proposed Project will have the beneficial effect of minimizing vehicle miles traveled by solid waste collection vehicles by establishing an exclusive franchise waste collection system whereby only a selected hauler would be authorized to collect solid resources from a given franchise zone. This would replace the current open-market system whereby collection vehicles from multiple permitted haulers traverse all areas of the City.
4. The Proposed Project will have the benefit of allowing the City to establish a fair and equitable rate structure for each franchise collection zone.
5. The Proposed Project will provide a mechanism for the City to mandate that all Solid Resources collection vehicles operated by the Franchised Hauler be late model, low-emission, clean-fuel vehicles to provide an air quality benefit.
6. The Proposed Project will provide economic benefits by allowing the City to require employees working under the franchise agreements to be paid, at a minimum, a living wage, in accordance with the City's Living Wage Ordinance.

The location and custodian of the environmental documents and/or other material which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based is:

Solid Resources Citywide Recycling Division
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bureau of Sanitation
1149 S. Broadway, 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90015

The sections that follow include: A) Project Overview; B) Comprehensive and detailed findings of the Proposed Project that include the key findings above regarding significant unavoidable impact and alternatives to the Proposed Project, and C) Comprehensive findings of the Project Alternatives, including the rationale and findings for selection of the Proposed Project, and rejection of the remaining alternatives.

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 3

OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

3.1 PROJECT GOALS

As discussed in the Draft Program EIR, the City has established the following ten Project Goals for the program.

1. Meet the City's Zero Waste Goals by establishing the maximum disposal for each zone, and implementing waste diversion programs that are consistent Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan (SWIRP) goals (see Section 2.6.2, Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan).
2. Meet and exceed California requirements for waste diversion and mandatory commercial and multifamily recycling.
3. Improve health and safety for Solid Resource workers under City contract provisions.
4. Improve efficiency of the City's Solid Resource system by maximizing the system's waste collection route efficiencies.
5. Improve the City's air quality by requiring late model, low emission, clean fuel vehicles for collection fleets and using exclusive zones to optimize routes and minimize vehicle miles traveled.
6. Provide the highest level of customer service through communication and delivery of services.
7. Create a consistent, clearly defined system with fair and equitable rates and contingency plans to ensure reliable service.
8. Create an environment that ensures long-term competition by utilizing a Request for Proposal (RFP) process that yields the best value service template for customers and allowing no more than 49% of the service to any individual hauler.
9. Ensure sufficient staffing to meet Program Goals.
10. Ensure reliable system infrastructure to provide uninterrupted service to customers.

3.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

The Proposed Project (Exclusive Franchise Waste Collection and Hauling System) is the staff-recommended Project that would replace the current open market system for the collection and handling of commercial Solid Resources in the City, with a franchised Solid Resources collection system comprised of 11 zones, with one exclusive Franchised Hauler per zone. Under the Proposed Project, Franchised Haulers would operate under the following conditions:

- The City has established 11 geographical franchise collection zones. These zones delineate the boundaries in which the Franchised Hauler would be allowed to operate.

- The City would award a Franchise Hauler the exclusive rights to operate in 1 of the 11 franchise collection zones.
- A single Franchised Hauler may be awarded more than one franchise collection zone.
- The City would establish a fair and equitable rate structure for each collection zone. The rate structure may be similar for multiple or all franchise collection zones. This rate structure would detail the rate schedule for Solid Resources collection services that Commercial Establishments will pay.
- The City would establish a formula and caps on how rates charged for Solid Resources collection services to Commercial Establishments can be increased annually.
- Under the Proposed Project, three collection streams are anticipated: Blue Bin Commingled Recyclables, Green Bin Organics, and Black Bin Solid Waste.
- Recycling services would include a blue bin system for the collection of commingled recyclables.
- Existing Organics recycling will be preserved. This includes restaurants participating in Sanitation's existing commercial food waste diversion program, existing green waste diversion from multifamily properties, and other recycling programs such as organics recycling from grocery stores. Haulers would be required, in a phased manner, to offer expanded Organics recycling as the necessary processing capacity is established.
- The City would mandate that every Commercial Establishment is provided a recycling service.
- The City would mandate maximum annual disposal levels and specific diversion requirements for each franchise zone to promote Solid Resources diversion from landfills.
- The City would mandate that all Solid Resources collection vehicles operated by the Franchised Hauler be late model, low-emission, clean-fuel vehicles.
- The City would require employees working under the franchise agreements to be paid, at a minimum, a living wage, in accordance with the City's Living Wage Ordinance.
- The Franchised Hauler would assist the City in complying with existing and new regulations.
- The Franchised Hauler would assist the City in citywide public education.
- The Franchised Hauler will provide consistent reporting on all downstream recycling activities.
- The City and the Franchised Hauler would participate in a partnership between the City and the franchised hauler to increase diversion and identify challenges.
- New or expanded material recovery facilities (MRFs) would be needed as recycling increases under the Proposed Project.
- New or expanded facilities that support collection activities, such as transfer stations and truck base yards, would be required.
- The location and processing capacity of the new or expanded MRFs, Organics processing facilities, and the locations of transfer stations and truck base yards are not known at this time.

- The following material types will not be collected as part of the Proposed Project:
 - Construction and Demolition (C&D) Waste, debris generated from construction activities
 - Medical Waste
 - Hazardous Waste
 - Radioactive Waste
 - Pharmaceutical Waste
 - Recyclables that have value to the generator, and are sold or donated
 - Green waste removed and recycled from a site as incidental to a landscaping business
 - Other specialty waste as designated by Sanitation (e.g., biosolids, fats, oils, and grease)

The expansion of existing, or the construction of new MRFs and Organics processing facilities will be needed under the Proposed Project, as the amount of Solid Resources diverted from landfills is expected to increase over time. Although the City estimates that two new commingled “Blue Bin” MRFs and four new Organics processing facilities will eventually be needed, their locations and capacities are not known at this time. The initial implementation of the Proposed Project is not contingent on these new facilities. While it is expected that new or expanded facilities will be needed to reach the City’s Zero Waste Goals, initial diversion efforts can be implemented under the Proposed Project, prior to additional facilities becoming available. Meeting the City’s other Project Goals and Objectives, such as requiring late model, clean fuel, low emission vehicles, and fair and equitable rates, is not contingent on new or expanded facilities.

As the locations of expanded or new facilities are not known, the expanded or new facilities were evaluated at a conceptual level in the Program EIR. In addition, expanded or new facilities will be further addressed in the project-specific environmental documentation prepared by the lead agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located. The Program EIR may be used upon approval, as appropriate as a tiering document for future facilities.

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 4

COMPREHENSIVE FINDINGS OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This section discusses the impacts and mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project, and makes findings as required under Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for all areas of significant or potentially significant impact.

The potentially significant impacts that could occur as a result of implementing the Proposed Project (see Section 3, below) prior to applying the mitigation measures would be in the following resource areas:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural resources
- Air quality
- Biological resources
- Cultural resources
- Geology and soils
- Hazards and hazardous materials
- Hydrology and water quality
- Land use
- Noise
- Recreation and parks
- Traffic (parking)
- Utilities

The two key components of the Proposed Project are: 1) collecting and transporting the solid resources generated by multi-family and commercial establishments within the City, and 2) the development of expanded or new materials processing facilities transfer stations, and truck base yards. All of the potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Project are associated with new facilities, not collection activities. Specific locations for the new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are not known at this time, and could occur in the City of Los Angeles, or within other jurisdictions. Each of the resource areas below is discussed in terms of:

- Descriptions of Potential Effects are specific descriptions of the environmental effects identified in the EIR as significant or potentially significant.
- Mitigation Measures are the proposed mitigation measures for the impacts identified as significant or potentially significant.
- Findings are the findings made in accordance with Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code. One of three findings is made for each significant or potentially significant impact,

in response to Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines. The significance of the environmental impacts after mitigation is also provided.

- Rationale is an explanation supporting the findings.
- References are notations on the section in the EIR that supports the findings.
- No findings are made pursuant to Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines for project impacts that are less than significant (and do not require mitigation).

4.1 AESTHETICS

This section discusses the anticipated impacts of the Proposed Project on aesthetic resources

Table 4.1-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts on aesthetic resources, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.1-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO AESTHETIC RESOURCES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| AES-1: Scenic Vistas | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| AES-2: Scenic Resources | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| AES-3: Visual Character | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| AES-4: Light or Glare | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.1.1 Description of Potential Effects

AES-1: Substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur within developed areas of the City using existing infrastructure, and would not result in development that could adversely affect a scenic resource, including scenic vistas, which form the basis for designation as a scenic highway.

The locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time; as a consequence, the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards could be located on lands zoned for industrial uses or agriculture, and potentially could result in adverse impacts to a designated scenic vista from construction-related disturbances and site development.

AES-2: Substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within the viewshed of a state scenic highway.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development that could damage a scenic resource, including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. However, the locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time; therefore, there is the possibility that future facility sites could be located in within the viewshed of a designated scenic highway. As a consequence, the siting of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards could potentially result in adverse impacts to scenic resources within the viewshed of a state scenic highway.

AES-3: Would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development that could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the areas and surroundings along collection routes throughout the City.

The locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time; as a consequence, the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards could have the potential to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings due to construction-related disturbances and site development.

AES-4: Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development that creates a new source of light or glare.

The new or expanded facilities and truck base yards would require site lighting; however, because the locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time, the construction and operation of expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards could have the potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

4.1.2 Mitigation Measures

AES-1: Substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista.

Mitigation measure VR-1 through VR-7, described in Section 3.2.1.6 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts on a scenic vista due to the siting of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards.

4.1.4 Rationale

Implementation of mitigation measures VR-1, and VR-2 would site new facilities and truck base yards in accordance with all applicable zoning and planning restrictions, and would require incorporation of design features that allow the facilities to blend in with nearby buildings. These requirements would prevent siting conflicts that could result in impacts to aesthetic resources. Mitigation measures VR-3, VR-4, and VR-5 would require replacement of natural aesthetic features if those features would be removed by the new facilities, would require incorporation of design features that integrate natural aesthetic features, and would minimize grading of natural and semi-natural open space areas to the maximum extent practicable. These measures would minimize the potential for new facilities to conflict with natural aesthetic features if they are sited on or near visual resources. Mitigation measures VR-6 and VR-7 would minimize the potential for degradation of visual character by requiring that utilities be placed underground, and require that certain facility features be screened from public view. Following implementation of the mitigation measures above, significant impacts are not anticipated.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.1.5 References

Section 3.2.1.4 of the Program EIR addresses the Proposed Project's aesthetic impacts and mitigation measures.

4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

This section discusses the anticipated impacts of the Proposed Project on agricultural resources.

Table 4.2-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts on agricultural resources, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| AG-1: Important Farmland | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| AG-2: Conflict with Agricultural Uses | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

**TABLE 4.2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| AG-3: Conflict with Forest Land Uses | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| AG-4: Conversion of Forest Lands | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| AG-5: Other Changes to Agricultural or Forest Lands | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.2.1 Description of Potential Effects

AG-1: Conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could convert the isolated locations of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance within the City to non-agricultural uses. There would be no impact.

The locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time; as a consequence, if future facility sites include locations that support Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) classified land, then there is a potential for a significant impact.

AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that would convert farmland to non-agricultural uses. There would be no impact.

The specific location of future new and/or expanded processing facilities and new truck base yards have not been identified at this time, therefore, the potential for these future facilities to conflict with existing zoning for agriculture use or a Williamson Act contract cannot be determined at this time. If future sites are proposed on lands that are zoned for agricultural use or contain a Williamson Act contract, then there is potential for an impact.

AG-3: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land.

No forest land or lands used for timber production are located within the City; therefore, the collection activities under the Proposed Project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural uses or forest lands.

The locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time. If future facilities are sited outside of the City, it is possible that the facilities could conflict with existing zoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, result in the loss of forest land or convert forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, there is a potential for a significant impact to occur.

AG-4: Loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

No forest land or lands used for timber production are located within the City; therefore, the collection activities under the Proposed Project would not convert forest lands to non-forest uses.

The locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time. If future facilities are sited outside of the City, it is possible that the facilities could result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, there is a potential for a significant impact to occur.

AG-5: Other changes that could result in conversion of farmland or forest land.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could convert farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses.

The location of future new and/or expanded processing facilities and new truck base yards have not been identified at this time. If future facilities are sited outside of the City, it is possible that the facilities could result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, there is a potential for a significant impact to occur.

4.2.2 Mitigation Measures

AG-1: Conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

Mitigation measure AG-1 through AG-4, described in Section 3.2.2.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts agricultural resources due to the siting of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards.

AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

Mitigation measure AG-1 through AG-4, described in Section 3.2.2.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts from potential conflicts with zoning for agricultural uses or lands under Williamson Act contracts associated with the siting of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards.

AG-3: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land.

Mitigation measure AG-1 through AG-4, described in Section 3.2.2.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts from potential conflicts with zoning for agricultural uses

or lands under Williamson Act contracts associated with the siting of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards.

AG-4: Loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Mitigation measure AG-1 through AG-4, described in Section 3.2.2.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts from conversion of forest land to non-forest uses that could arise from future siting of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards.

AG-5: Other changes that could result in conversion of farmland or forest land.

Mitigation measure AG-1 through AG-4, described in Section 3.2.2.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts from conversion of forest land to non-forest uses that could arise from future siting of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards.

4.2.3 Findings

The following finding is made for agricultural impact AG-1 (farmland conversion), AG-2 (agricultural zone conflicts), AG-3 (forest land zone conflicts), AG-4 (forest land conversion), and AG-5 (other changes):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measures AG-1, AG-2, AG-3, and AG-4, the above potential impacts related to conversion or loss of farmland (Impact AG-1), agricultural zone conflicts (Impact AG-2), conflicts with lands zoned for forest land (AG-3), conversion or loss of forest land (AG-4), and other changes that affect farmland or forest land (AG-5), related to new or expanded facilities or truck base yards under the Proposed Project, are found to be:

[] Significant [**XX**] **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.2.4 Rationale

Implementation of mitigation measures AG-1, AG-2, and AG-3 would address impacts to farmland through the payment of fees into an agricultural conservation trust (AG-1), would require facility site location adjustments away from lands under a Williamson Act Contract (AG-2), and would require facility site location adjustments away from lands zoned for agricultural uses. Similarly, mitigation measures AG-4 would address impacts to forest land or timberlands through the payment of fees into a forest conservation trust, or through facility site location adjustments away from lands zoned for Timberland Production to the maximum extent. Following implementation of the mitigation measures above, significant impacts are not anticipated.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.3 AIR QUALITY

This section discusses the air quality impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.3-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated air quality impacts, based on the evaluation in the Draft Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.3-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO AIR QUALITY**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| AQ-1: Conflict With Or Obstruct The Implementation Of The Applicable Air Quality Plan | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| AQ-2: Violate Any Air Quality Standard Or Contribute Substantially To An Existing Or Projected Air Quality Violation | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| AQ-3: Result In A Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase Of Any Criteria Pollutant For Which The Project Region Is In Nonattainment Under An Applicable Federal Or State Ambient Air Quality Standard | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | Yes |

**TABLE 4.3-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO AIR QUALITY**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| AQ-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors To Substantial Pollutant Concentrations | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| AQ-5: Create Objectionable Odors Affecting A Substantial Number Of People | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.3.1 Description of Potential Effects

AQ-1: Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plans.

Implementation of the collection activities under the Proposed Project are not projected to cause emission increases that exceed the SCAQMD CEQA thresholds. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would eliminate diesel emissions by using 100 percent alternative-fuel SWCVs starting the first day of the Proposed Project's operation. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to air quality and would not result in conflicts with an air quality management plan.

Operational emissions from the potential new or expanded transfer stations, materials processing facilities, and new truck base yards are assumed to exceed significance thresholds in the Program EIR; therefore, the new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, or truck base yards could result in conflicts with air quality management plans, which is considered to be a potentially significant impact.

AQ-2: Violate Air Quality Standards or Contribute Substantially to an Existing or Projected Air Quality Violation.

None of the pollutants generated from the collection activities under the Proposed Project would result in an emission increase that exceeds the SCAQMD CEQA significance thresholds. Therefore, air quality impacts from collection activities under the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Operational emissions from the potential new or expanded transfer stations, materials processing facilities, and new truck base yards are assumed to exceed significance thresholds in the Program EIR; therefore, the new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, or truck base yards could exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants, which is considered to be potentially significant.

Similarly, construction impacts of the potential new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new truck base yards are assumed to exceed significance thresholds in the Program EIR, which is considered to be potentially significant.

AQ-3: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.

Collection activities under the Proposed Project would not exceed the CEQA Thresholds of Significance established by SCAQMD. Therefore, the cumulative impacts from the Proposed Project's collection activities would be less than significant.

Construction and operation of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, or truck base yards could result in emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Additionally, future stationary source emissions from such facilities would further contribute to exceedences to the SCAQMD thresholds, in conjunction with emissions from related projects. Therefore, the expanded and new facilities under the Proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants.

AQ-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.

Operation of Solid Waste Collection Vehicles in the franchise zones is not expected to cause the vehicles congregate at a single location, or to change the local traffic patterns in a manner that might cause additional congestion at intersections. An individual collection vehicle traveling or idling on local streets or stopping at an intersection is not expected to increase local CO concentrations to cause new hot spots. Therefore, the collection activities under the Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial CO concentrations.

Implementation of federal, state, and local regulations that reduce emissions of air toxics, especially diesel particulate matter (DPM), cancer risks due to DPM in the region are expected to decrease in future years regardless of the regional growth in vehicle miles traveled with or without the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would require the use of 100 percent alternative-fuel vehicles starting the first day of implementation, which is one step ahead of the CARB SWCV rule (retrofitting requirements to 2006 model and older) and the SCAQMD Rule 1193 (alternative-fuel vehicles are required for only new purchases or new lease). Therefore, the Proposed Project is expected to further decrease the mobile-source air toxic emissions, especially DPM, by eliminating DPM emissions from the solid waste collection vehicle fleets. Because DPM is the cancer risk driver in South Coast Air Basin, the collection activities under the Proposed Project would be beneficial to the regional emission reduction of DPM, thereby reducing the population exposure to mobile source air toxics and reduce the resulted cancer risks in the area.

Since the specific locations of future facilities have not been identified; however, the Program EIR assumed that sensitive receptors could be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations, which is potentially significant.

AQ-5: Create Objectionable Odors.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project do not fall into any category of land use or industrial operations for which odor nuisances are associated with. In addition, alternative-fuel vehicles such as those that would be used for collection activities tend to have less odorous

emissions than diesel vehicles. Therefore, the collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in significant odor impacts.

Expanded or new processing facilities and transfer stations could fall into one or more of these categories and could, therefore, could result in potentially significant odor impacts, depending on the location of the new facilities and whether sensitive receptors are located nearby.

4.3.2 Mitigation Measures

AQ-1: Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plans.

Mitigation measure AQ-14 through AQ-20, described in Section 3.1.1.6 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant air quality impacts associated with operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

AQ-2: Violate Air Quality Standards or Contribute Substantially to an Existing or Projected Air Quality Violation.

Mitigation measure AQ-14 through AQ-20, described in Section 3.1.1.6 of the Program EIR, would reduce potentially significant air quality impacts associated with operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards; however, potentially significant impact could still remain after mitigation.

Mitigation measure AQ-1 through AQ-13, described in Section 3.1.1.6 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant air quality impacts associated with construction of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. However, there would still be a potential for significant air quality impacts from facility construction after mitigation.

AQ-3: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of any Criteria Pollutant.

Mitigation measure AQ-1 through AQ-21, described in Section 3.1.1.6 of the Program EIR, would address the potentially significant air quality impacts associated with cumulative air impacts to air quality from construction or operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. However, although emissions would be reduced, there could still be a potential for significant cumulative air quality impacts.

AQ-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.

Mitigation measure AQ-1 through AQ-20, described in Section 3.1.1.6 of the Program EIR, would address potential exposure of sensitive receptors to air pollutants associated with construction and operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. However, there would still be a potential for significant air quality impacts from facilities after mitigation

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section discusses the anticipated impacts of the Proposed Project on biological resources.

Table 4.4-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts to biological resources, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.4-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| BIO-1: Special Status Species | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| BIO-2: Riparian Habitat | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| BIO-3: Wetlands | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| BIO-4: Wildlife Movement | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| BIO-5: Protected Biological Resources | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| BIO-6: Habitat Conservation Plans | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |

4.4.1 Description of Potential Effects

BIO-1: Substantial adverse effects on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development or physical changes that could damage or otherwise modify habitat that supports candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan, are not located in SEAs, and are likely devoid of habitat required to support candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.

However, outside of the City, it is possible that lands zoned for industrial or agricultural uses could be undisturbed, and as such, could contain special-status species or their habitat. As a consequence, if the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards would be located on undisturbed lands zoned for industrial uses or for agriculture, they could potentially result in adverse impacts directly to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species or to habitat that supports such species, if present, from construction-related disturbances and site development. Therefore, new transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards under the Proposed Project could result in significant impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.

BIO-2: Substantial adverse effects on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

Although areas with riparian habitat and natural communities exist within the City, these areas (such as the unlined portions of the Los Angeles River, and undeveloped mountain areas) are distinctly separate from the developed routes where collection activities would occur. Therefore, the collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in impacts to riparian habitat.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan, are not located in Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), and do not support riparian habitat or natural communities.

However, outside of the City, there is the possibility that lands zoned for industrial or agricultural uses could be undisturbed, and as such, could contain some riparian habitat. As a consequence, if the expanded or new processing facilities and truck base yards are on undisturbed lands zoned for industrial uses or agriculture, they could potentially result in adverse impacts to riparian habitat or other natural community from construction-related disturbances and site development.

Therefore, new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards under from the Proposed Project could potentially result in significant impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities.

BIO-3: Substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

Although wetlands exist within the City, they are generally confined to watercourses or undeveloped areas where collection activities would not occur. Therefore, the collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in impacts to wetlands.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan and do not support wetlands.

However, outside of the City, there is the possibility that lands zoned for industrial or agricultural uses could be undisturbed, and as such, could contain wetlands. As a consequence, if the

expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards would be located on undisturbed lands zoned for industrial uses or agriculture, they could potentially result in adverse impacts to wetlands from construction-related disturbances and site development. Therefore, new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards under the Proposed Project could potentially result in significant impacts to wetlands.

BIO-4: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur within developed areas of the City using existing infrastructure, and therefore would not physically impede the movement of wildlife species or the migration of wildlife through wildlife corridors.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas are generally established in the applicable General Plan, are not located in SEAs, and are devoid of wildlife habitat.

However, outside of the City, there is the possibility that lands zoned for industrial or agricultural uses could be undisturbed, and as such, could serve as a migratory wildlife corridor. As a consequence, if new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards are on undisturbed lands zoned for industrial uses or for agriculture, they could potentially interfere with the movement of any wildlife species or with a wildlife corridor. Therefore, new transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards under Proposed Project could potentially result in significant impacts to biological resources related to interference with wildlife movement.

BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur within developed areas of the City using existing infrastructure, and therefore would not result affect protected trees.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan and are generally devoid of protected trees.

However, there could be instances where protected trees are located on such sites, and on potential facility sites located outside of the City. As a consequence, if the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards on lands zoned for industrial uses or agriculture, they could potentially result in adverse impacts to protected trees from construction-related disturbances and site development. Therefore, new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards under the Proposed Project could result in significant impacts to protected trees.

BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development, and would not occur in areas under a habitat or natural community conservation plan.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas are generally established in the applicable General Plan and are not subject to habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that seek to preserve habitat of value in its natural state. As such, the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and base yards, and the location of Organics processing facilities (depending on the processing technology) on areas zoned as agriculture are not expected to conflict with a habitat conservation plan, a natural community conservation plan, or other approved conservation plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in impacts related to conflicts with habitat or natural community conservation plans.

4.4.2 Mitigation Measures***BIO-1: Substantial adverse effects on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.***

Mitigation measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, described in Section 3.2.3.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts to special status biological resources associated with operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

BIO-2: Substantial adverse effects on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

Mitigation measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, described in Section 3.2.3.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural area associated with operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

BIO-3: Substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

Mitigation measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, described in Section 3.2.3.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts to wetlands associated with operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

BIO-4: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife.

Mitigation measure BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3, described in Section 3.2.3.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts to wildlife movement that could result from

operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Mitigation measure BIO-3, described in Section 3.2.3.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts to protected trees that could result from operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

No significant impacts to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan are anticipated.

4.4.3 Findings

For the above impacts to biological resources, the following finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, and BIO-4, potential impacts associated with expanded or new processing facilities, transfer stations and truck base yards to special status species (Impact BIO-1), riparian habitat (Impact BIO-2), wetlands (Impact BIO-3), and wildlife movement (Impact BIO-4) are found to be:

Potentially Significant **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.4.4 Rationale

Under mitigation measure BIO-1, a qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment to evaluate the site's potential to support biological resources (including special status plant species, wildlife species, riparian habitat, wetlands, and wildlife corridors) prior to the approval of any new or expanded transfer stations, processing facility, or truck base yards that could result in earth-disturbing activities (e.g., grubbing, grading). To the extent feasible, the location(s) of all new or expanded transfer stations, and processing facilities shall be on previously disturbed or developed sites and shall avoid undisturbed, high-quality, natural habitat that supports special status biological resources. If the habitat assessment determines that there is the potential for significant impacts to any biological resources, additional surveys and/or documentation would be required pursuant to further site-specific evaluations under CEQA.

Under mitigation measure BIO-2, if it has been determined that a new or expanded transfer station, processing facility, or truck base yard has the potential for significant impacts to any biological resources, then prior to commencement of any earth-moving activities, an appropriate focused survey(s) shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of special status species (i.e., plant and/or wildlife surveys), riparian habitat, wetlands, and wildlife corridors that could be significantly impacted by the facility. If biological resources are identified on or adjacent to the facility site, then appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures shall be implemented, as approved by the resource agencies with jurisdiction over that species and subject to the necessary permits under FESA, CESA, the California Fish and Game Code, and other applicable regional or local regulations or plans, and ensure that impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

Mitigation measure BIO-3 requires compliance with local biological resource protection regulations, including native tree protection ordinances, which will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Following implementation of these mitigation measures, significant impacts are not anticipated.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.4.5 References

Section 3.2.3 of the Program EIR addresses the Proposed Project's air quality impacts and mitigation measures.

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section discusses the anticipated impacts of the Proposed Project on cultural resources.

Table 4.5-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts to cultural resources, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.5-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO CULTURAL RESOURCES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|---|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| CUL-1: Historic Resources | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| CUL-2: Archaeological Resources | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| CUL-3: Paleontological Resources | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| CUL-4: Human Remains | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.5.1 Description of Potential Effects

CUL-1: Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project could provide collection service to historic buildings, or travel over historic structures such as bridges, but collection activities would not result in physical changes or new development that could damage or otherwise adversely affect a historic resource.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. In general, industrial areas are utilitarian in design and character, which do not meet the requirements to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, designation as a Historic-Cultural Monument, or a contribution to an HPOZ. Although no facilities are currently proposed, future facilities could still result in significant cumulative impacts to historical resources, if such resources are present on future facility sites, because whereas local regulations provide for the mitigation of impacts, they do not explicitly prohibit the demolition or alteration of historical resources.

CUL-2: Substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could damage or otherwise adversely affect an archaeological resource. Therefore, collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in impacts to archaeological resources.

Future new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be located and constructed in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses (due to

the industrial nature of the facilities). Although industrial and agricultural areas generally have a low probability for containing archaeological resources due to the disturbed nature of these areas, without site specific information, whether or not the future facilities would adversely affect archaeological resources cannot be definitively determined at this time. Therefore, mitigation was provided to address potentially significant impact to archaeological resources from future facilities and truck base yards.

CUL-3: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could damage or otherwise adversely affect a unique geologic resource or paleontological resource. Therefore, collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in impacts to paleontological resources.

Future new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses (due to the industrial nature of the facilities). Although industrial and agricultural areas generally have a low probability for containing paleontological resources due to the disturbed nature of these areas, without site-specific information, whether or not the future facilities would adversely affect paleontological resources cannot be definitively determined at this time. Therefore, mitigation was provided to address potentially significant impact to paleontological resources from future facilities and truck base yards.

CUL-4: Disturb any human remains.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could damage or otherwise adversely affect human remains. Therefore, collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in impacts to human remains.

Future new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses (due to the industrial nature of the facilities). Industrial and agricultural areas are expected to have a low probability for containing human remains interred outside formal cemeteries due to the disturbed nature of these areas. Therefore, construction of new or expanded processing facilities and truck base yards is not expected to encounter interred human remains.

4.5.2 Mitigation Measures

CUL-1: Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Mitigation measure CR-4, described in Section 3.1.2.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts to historic resources associated with construction and operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. However, impacts after mitigation would remain potentially significant.

CUL-2: Substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

Mitigation measure CR-1, described in Section 3.1.2.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources associated with construction and operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

CUL-3: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.

Mitigation measure CR-2, described in Section 3.1.2.7 of the Program EIR, would address potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources associated with construction and operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

CUL-4: Disturb any human remains.

Mitigation measure CR-3, described in Section 3.1.2.7 of the Program EIR, would be implemented in the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during construction of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards. Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

4.5.3 Findings

Regarding potential impacts to cultural resources, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measure CR-4, potential impacts to historic resources (Impact CUL-1) are found to be:

[XX] Significant [] Not significant

With mitigation measures CR-2, CR-3, and CR-4, impacts to archaeological resources (Impact CUL-2), paleontological resources (Impact CUL-3), and human remains (Impact CUL-4), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant [**XX**] **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.5.4 Rationale

For Impact CUL-1 (Historic Resources), the Program EIR determined that there is a potential for significant impacts to historic resources that could result from expanded or new processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards if they are site near such resources or in a manner that could damage historic resources. Although Mitigation measure CR-4 would largely address potential impacts to historic resources from new or expanded facilities, potentially significant impacts would still remain because whereas local regulations and site-specific CEQA documentation provide for the mitigation of impacts, they do not explicitly prohibit the demolition or alteration of historical resources. Thus, impacts to historic resources could still remain.

Mitigation for potential impacts to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains are expected to address the potential impacts to a level below significance.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.5.5 References

Section 3.1.2 of the Program EIR addresses the Proposed Project's cultural resource impacts and mitigation measures.

4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

This section discusses the anticipated geology and soils impacts of the Proposed Project.

Table 4.6-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts to geology and soils, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.6-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| GEO-1: Earthquake Faults | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

**TABLE 4.6-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| GEO-2: Seismic Ground Shaking | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| GEO-3: Seismic Related Ground Failure | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| GEO-4: Landslides | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| GEO-5: Soil Erosion | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| GEO-6: Unstable Geologic Units or Soil | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| GEO-7: Expansive Soil | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| GEO-8: Soils and Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |

4.6.1 Description of Potential Effects

GEO-1: Risks associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could expose people to injury or risks associated with earthquake faults.

It is unlikely that future new or expanded facilities would be sited in a manner that exposes people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects related to the rupture of a known earthquake fault. However, the locations of future facilities are unknown at this time. If future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards are constructed in proximity to active mapped faults, a potentially significant impact could occur.

GEO-2: Risk associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could expose people to injury or risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

The locations of future facilities are unknown at this time, and as a consequence, future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards could be constructed in locations that expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects resulting from strong seismic ground shaking, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

Implementation of mitigation measure GS-2 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

GEO-3: Risk associated seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could expose people to injury or risks associated with seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

The locations of future facilities are unknown at this time, and as a consequence, future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards could be constructed in locations that expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects resulting from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

GEO-4: Risk associated landslides.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could expose people to injury or risks associated with landslides or slope failures.

The locations of future facilities are unknown at this time, and as a consequence, future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards could be constructed in locations that expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects resulting from landslides.

GEO-5: Substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could cause substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Future new or expanded facilities would be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include an identification of best management practices (BMPs) to be implemented during project construction. Implementation of BMP required as part of the SWPPP would keep potential erosion impacts to below a level of significance. As a consequence, new and expanded facilities and truck base yards under the Proposed Project are not expected to result in significant topsoil or erosion impacts.

GEO-6: Unstable geologic unit or soil.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development on unstable geologic units or unstable soil that could result in additional geologic impacts such as landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse.

The locations of future facilities are unknown at this time, and as a consequence, future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards could be constructed on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

GEO-7: Expansive soil.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could be affected by expansive soil conditions.

The locations of future facilities are unknown at this time; future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards could be constructed on an area with expansive soil, which is a potentially significant impact.

GEO-8: Soils incapable of supporting use of alternative wastewater disposal systems.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development, including septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

The expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities and truck base yards in industrial areas would not use alternative wastewater disposal systems, as these areas are served by sewer systems. Organics facilities could be sited in agricultural areas; however, these areas usually on alluvial soils with adequate drainage characteristics, which are not expected to be incapable of supporting alternative wastewater disposal systems. In the event a septic system is proposed as part of a new facility, soil testing would be required to properly design the septic system. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant soil impacts related to the use, or development, of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

4.6.2 Mitigation Measures

GEO-1: Risks associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault.

Mitigation measure GS-1, described in Section 3.4.2.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant impacts related to siting new facilities in close proximity to active mapped faults. Implementation of mitigation measure GS-1 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

GEO-2: Risk associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

Mitigation measure GS-2, described in Section 3.4.2.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant seismic shaking impacts associated with new or expanded facilities.

Implementation of mitigation measure GS-2 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

GEO-3: Risk associated seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

Mitigation measures GS-2 and GS-3, described in Section 3.4.2.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant seismic shaking impacts associated with new or expanded facilities. Implementation of mitigation measures GS-2 and GS-3 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

GEO-4: Risk associated landslides.

Mitigation measures GS-2 and GS-4, described in Section 3.4.2.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant risks associated with the exposure of new or expanded facilities to geologic hazards, including landslide. Implementation of mitigation measures GS-2 and GS-4 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

GEO-5: Substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

The Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant topsoil or erosion impacts and no mitigation is required.

GEO-6: Unstable geologic unit or soil.

Mitigation measure GS-2, described in Section 3.4.2.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant risks associated with the exposure of new or expanded facilities to unstable geologic unit or soils. Implementation of mitigation measure GS-2 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

GEO-7: Expansive soil.

Mitigation measure GS-2, described in Section 3.4.2.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant impacts associated with the exposure of new or expanded facilities to expansive soils. Implementation of mitigation measure GS-2 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

GEO-8: Soils incapable of supporting use of alternative wastewater disposal systems.

The Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant impacts related to alternative wastewater disposal systems, and no mitigation is required.

4.6.3 Findings

For the above impacts, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

- [] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measures GS-1, GS-2, GS-3, and GS-4, impacts associated with siting new facilities or truck base yards in close proximity to a mapped active earthquake fault (Impact GEO-1), impacts related to seismic shaking (GEO-2), impacts associated with seismically-induced ground failure (GEO-3), impacts related to exposure to geologic hazards (Impact GEO-4), impacts related to exposure to unstable geologic units or soils (Impact GEO-6), and impacts related to expansive soils (Impact GEO-7), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant [**XX**] **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.6.4 Rationale

Under mitigation measure GS-1 future new or expanded facilities would not be located in an area mapped as an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the placement of structures for human occupancy shall be restricted from these areas. This would prevent potentially significant impacts (Impact GEO-1) related to siting of new facilities near active faults from occurring.

Under mitigation measure GS-2, a site-specific geotechnical report would be prepared in areas subject to hazards related to seismic shaking, as mandated by the State Seismic Hazard Mapping Act at the time a site is selected for a new or expanded facility. Mitigation measure GS-2 would reduce potential impacts related to seismic shaking (Impact GEO-2), unstable geologic units (Impact GEO-6), and expansive soils (Impact GEO-7) to below a level of significance.

Under mitigation measure GS-3, future new or expanded facilities would not be located within an area known for or designated with a high liquefaction potential, and placement of structures for human occupancy would be restricted from areas known for ground failure or liquefaction. Mitigation measures GS-3, in conjunction with measure GS-2, would reduce impacts associated with seismically induced ground failure (Impact GEO-3) to below a level of significance.

Under mitigation measure GS-4, future new or expanded facilities would not be located in areas mapped as a landslide or mudslide hazard area in local planning documents (e.g., General Plans). Mitigation measures GS-4, in conjunction with measure GS-2, would reduce impacts associated with landslides (Impact GEO-4) to below a level of significance.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.6.5 References

Section 3.2.4 of the Draft EIR discuss the project's geology and soils impacts and mitigation measures.

4.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

This section discusses the anticipated greenhouse gas emission impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.7-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated greenhouse gas emission impacts, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.7-1
SUMMARY OF GREENHOUSE GAS IMPACTS**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| GHG-1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| GHG-2: Conflict With Plan or Policy | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |

4.7.1 Description of Potential Effects

GHG-1: Generation of greenhouse gas emissions

Direct GHG emissions related to the Proposed Project's solid waste collection activities were estimated and compared to the State and global GHG emission levels. Based on the nature of GHG emissions and the exceedingly small potential GHG impacts of the Proposed Project, the GHG emissions from the collection activities under the Proposed Project will not result in reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment. Further, operational GHG emissions resulting from collection activities would be considered to be less than significant on climate change.

Operations of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would be expected to result in substantially less GHG emissions than the collection activities

because VMTs associated with such facilities would not be substantive. Furthermore, the new or expanded facilities are not likely to be classified as a major source of GHG emissions.

GHG-2: Conflicts with greenhouse gas reduction policies

The Proposed Project's GHG emissions from collection activities would not contribute substantial amount to the State emissions inventory, and would not interfere with the AB 32 Scoping Plan and the long-term goal of AB 32 to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Further, the greenhouse gas emission from the collection activities under the Proposed Project are not expected to conflict or delay the implementation of the policies, plans, and regulations set forth by the state and local agencies to reduce GHG emissions.

GHG emissions from new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are not expected to generate significant levels of GHG emissions or conflict with GHG plans or policies.

4.7.2 Mitigation Measures

GHG-1: Generation of greenhouse gas emissions

The Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant impacts related to generation of greenhouse gas emissions, no mitigation is required.

GHG-2: Conflicts with greenhouse gas reduction policies

The Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant impacts related to generation of greenhouse gas emissions or conflicts plans or policies designed to reduce generation of greenhouse gas emission. No mitigation is required.

4.7.3 Findings

No findings are made regarding greenhouse gas emissions pursuant to Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, as anticipated greenhouse gas emission impacts would be less than significant.

4.7.4 Rationale

No rationale is provided herein regarding greenhouse gas emissions findings pursuant to Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, as anticipated greenhouse gas emission impacts would be less than significant.

4.7.5 References

Section 3.1.3 of the Draft EIR discusses the project's greenhouse gas emission impacts.

4.8 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section discusses the hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.8-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated hazards and hazardous materials impacts, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.8-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| HAZ-1: Public Hazard from Transport, Use or Disposal of Hazardous Materials | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| HAZ-2: Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| HAZ-3: Emit Hazards Within One-Quarter Mile of a School | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| HAZ-4: Locate Project on Hazardous Material Site | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| HAZ-5: Proximity to Public Airport | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| HAZ-6: Proximity to Private Airport | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| HAZ-7: Interference with Emergency Response Plan | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| HAZ-8: Exposure to Wildland Fires | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.8.1 Description of Potential Effects

HAZ-1: Hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Collection activities associated with the Proposed Project would not involve the collection or transport of hazardous materials, as such materials would be specifically excluded from the proposed Program. Fleet operators are expected to routinely maintain their collection vehicles, which may involve the use of products that are considered hazardous such as lubricants, solvents, and cleaners. However, these materials would be used at fleet yards in compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing their use, storage, transport and disposal. In addition, use of such products is expected to be confined to the fleet yards or other maintenance facilities. Therefore, collection activities would not expose the public or the environment to hazards from their use.

Operators of expanded or new processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are expected to routinely maintain their equipment, which may involve the use of products that are considered hazardous such as lubricants, solvents, welding supplies, and cleaners, and these products would be used in compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing their use, storage, transport, and disposal. Such products are expected to be confined to the facility grounds and would not expose the public or the environment to hazards from their use. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

HAZ-2: Hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials.

Hazardous materials would be specifically excluded from the proposed Program; therefore, collection activities would not create a hazard to the public through reasonably foreseeable accidents.

Facility operators are expected to routinely maintain their equipment, which may involve the use of products that are considered hazardous such as lubricants, solvents, welding supplies, and cleaners, but these materials would be stored in relatively small quantities in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, which are expected to keep potentially significant hazards to the public or the environment related to accidents below a level of significance. Therefore, operations of expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are not expected to 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.

HAZ-3: Hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a school.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not involve the use or processing of materials that could emit hazardous materials or emissions during collection activities. Therefore, collection activities would not emit hazardous emissions within one quarter mile of a public school.

Facility operations would consist of further separating recyclables and organics into more defined diversion streams, which would not involve industrial processes that typically are associated with hazardous emissions. Use and storage of small amounts of hazardous materials such as lubricants, solvents, welding supplies, and cleaners to maintain processing equipment would be confined to the processing facilities (and incidental hazardous materials for vehicle maintenance at truck base yards) and are not expected to result in hazardous or acutely hazardous emissions that could result in significant impacts to schools.

HAZ-4: Be located on a hazardous materials sites could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Although it is possible that collection activities under the Proposed Project could occur from hazardous materials sites identified as such pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the collection activities are not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because collection would not physically disturb those sites. Therefore, collection activities would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment by disturbing hazardous materials sites.

As the specific locations of expanded or new processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are unknown at this time, there is a potential for the facilities to be located on or adjacent to a site that is listed by DTSC as needing corrective action. This represents a potentially significant impact.

HAZ-5: Safety hazard related to the Project being located within 2 miles of a public airport.

Although it is possible that collection activities could occur from establishments within 2 miles of a public airport, collection would occur at ground level and would not pose a threat to flight safety or result in hazards to people working or residing in the vicinity of an airport.

As the specific locations of expanded or new processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are unknown at this time, there is potential for the facilities to be located within 2-miles of a public airport, which could result in potential safety hazards due to airport proximity, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

HAZ-6: Safety hazard related to the Project being located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Although it is possible that collection activities could occur from establishments within the vicinity of a private airport (such as heliports), collection would occur at ground level and would not pose a threat to flight safety or result in hazards to people working or residing in the vicinity.

As the specific locations of expanded or new processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are unknown at this time, there is potential for the facilities to be located in close proximity to a private airport. Due to this uncertainty, a potentially significant impact to airports is identified.

HAZ-7: Interfere physically with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

Although collection vehicles would use existing transportation infrastructure, their use is consistent with transportation uses and current collection methods and would not block streets, highways, or freeways. Therefore, collection activities are not expected to impair implementation or physically interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans or activities.

Regarding expanded or new processing facilities and truck base yards, the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act was enacted to help communities protect public health, safety, and the environment from chemical hazards. SARA provides the requirements for emergency release notification, chemical inventory reporting, and toxic release inventories for facilities that handle chemicals. Depending on where the future facilities are located and the types of materials they handle, community emergency plans may need to be reviewed and updated. A potentially significant impact is assumed ensure that applicable community emergency plans reflect the expanded or new processing facilities, transfer stations, and base yards.

HAZ-8: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

The collection of materials diverted from the Solid Resource activities would occur in the largely urbanized areas of the City, and these urbanized areas have replaced wildland areas and reduced the potential for wildland fires. Therefore, the collection activities under the Proposed Project is not expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

As the specific locations of expanded or new processing facilities and truck base yards are unknown at this time, there is a potential that the facility could 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. This represents a potentially significant impact.

4.8.2 Mitigation Measures

HAZ-1: Hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

The Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant impacts related to the routine use of hazardous materials, and no mitigation is required.

HAZ-2: Hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials.

The Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials, and no mitigation is required.

HAZ-3: Hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a school.

The Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant impacts to schools related to release of hazardous emissions or acutely hazardous materials, and no mitigation is required.

HAZ-4: Be located on a hazardous materials sites could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Mitigation measure HAZ-1, described in Section 3.2.5.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant hazards to the public related to siting expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards on hazardous materials sites. Implementation of mitigation measure HAZ-1 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

HAZ-5: Safety hazard related to the Project being located within 2 miles of a public airport.

Mitigation measure HAZ-2, described in Section 3.2.5.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant hazards to the public related to siting expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards in close proximity to a public airport. Implementation of mitigation measure HAZ-2 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

HAZ-6: Safety hazard related to the Project being located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation measure HAZ-2, described in Section 3.2.5.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant hazards to the public related to siting expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards in close proximity to a private airport. Implementation of mitigation measure HAZ-2 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

HAZ-7: Interfere physically with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

Mitigation measures HAZ-3, HAZ-4, HAZ-5, HAZ-6, and HAZ-7 described in Section 3.2.5.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant hazards related to facility impacts on applicable community emergency plans are addressed. Implementation of mitigation measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-7 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

HAZ-8: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Mitigation measure HAZ-8, described in Section 3.2.5.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant hazards to the public related to siting expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards in areas subject to wildland fires. Implementation of mitigation measure HAZ-8 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

4.8.3 Findings

For the above potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-8, the potential for expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards to result in hazards to the public related to siting the future facilities on a hazardous materials site (Impact HAZ-4), siting future facilities in close proximity to a public airport (Impact HAZ-5), siting future facilities in close proximity to a private airport (Impact HAZ-6), future facilities' potential to adversely affect community emergency plans (Impact HAZ-7), and siting future facilities in areas subject to wildland fires (Impact HAZ-8), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant **[XX] Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.8.4 Rationale

Regarding impact related to siting of new facilities on hazardous materials sites (Impact HAZ-4), mitigation measure HAZ-1 requires that Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) be conducted in conformance with industry-accepted practices prior to siting new facilities. The assessments will identify whether or not the site is a hazardous materials site, and if so, identifies recommendations for determining the extent of contamination, and if applicable, remediation options. Any subsequent remediation of hazardous materials would comply with applicable laws and regulations, as well as agency oversight, which would keep potential hazards to the public below a level of significance.

Regarding impacts related to siting of new facilities near a public airport (Impact HAZ-5) and private airport (Impact HAZ-6), mitigation measure HAZ-2 requires that the facilities be relocated or incorporate design features that would eliminate the potential safety hazards. Mitigation measure would keep potential hazards to the public below a level of significance.

Regarding impacts to applicable community emergency plans related to siting of new facilities (Impact HAZ-7), mitigation measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-7 require that applicable community emergency plan shall be developed, reviewed and updated, as needed, to account for new facilities, that future facilities provide barriers, as needed, that hazardous substances be stored away from site boundaries, that health and safety plans be developed in accordance with local, state, and federal occupational health regulations, and that spill containment be implemented as needed. Mitigation measure would keep potential hazards to the public below a level of significance.

Regarding impacts related to siting of new facilities in areas subject to wildland fires (Impact HAZ-8), mitigation measure HAZ-8 require that a Fire Safety Plan be developed for use during construction and operation of any new facility. This measure would reduce the potential of wildland fires to below a level of significance.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.8.5 References

Section 3.2.5 of the Draft EIR discusses the Proposed Project's hazards and hazardous materials impacts and related mitigation.

4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

This section discusses the hydrology and water quality impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.9-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated hydrology and water quality based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.9-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| WQ-1: Water Quality Standards | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| WQ-2: Groundwater | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |

**TABLE 4.9-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|---|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| WQ-3: Erosion | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| WQ-4: Flooding | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| WQ-5: Storm Drain Capacity | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| WQ-6: Otherwise Degrade Water Quality | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| WQ-7: Housing in Flood Hazard Areas | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| WQ-8: Flood Flow Obstructions | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| WQ-9: Risks From Flooding Due to Failure of a Dam or Levee | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| WQ-10: Inundation | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |

4.9.1 Description of Potential Effects

WQ-1: Violate any water quality standards.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in discharges in the watersheds that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

There is the possibility that site runoff could be tainted and enter waterways and receiving waters, depending on the locations of the new or expanded facilities. In addition, runoff generated during construction of these facilities could contain contaminants that could enter waterways and receiving waters. Therefore, new and expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards have the potential to result in a violation of water quality standards, which is considered a potentially significant water quality impact.

WQ-2: Substantially deplete groundwater or interfere with groundwater recharge.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in the extraction of groundwater or the placement of impervious surfaces upon established groundwater recharge areas.

Lands zoned for industrial, manufacturing, and agricultural uses are not generally used for groundwater recharge. In addition, local permitting processes would prevent new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards from encroaching on designated groundwater recharge areas. Furthermore, water needed for operation of the facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be provided by existing water distribution systems and would not extract groundwater. Therefore, future new or expanded handling facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

WQ-3: Substantially alter drainage pattern in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation.

The collection activities associated with the Proposed Project would not result in alternations to existing drainage patterns, would not affect streams or rivers, and would not cause erosion or siltation.

Although development of facilities would not likely result in onsite erosion or siltation, runoff from the new or expanded facilities could increase downstream drainage volumes, which could in turn result in erosion or siltation if downstream drainage facilities are unlined channels or otherwise have natural features. Therefore, the Proposed Project could result in significant siltation or erosion impacts if drainage facilities downstream of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, or truck base yards are unlined or are natural streams.

WQ-4: Substantially alter drainage pattern in a manner that would result in flooding.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in alternations to existing drainage patterns, or affect streams or rivers that in turn could result in flooding.

Development of new or expanded facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would result in runoff from the sites that could increase downstream drainage volumes, which could in turn result in flooding if the capacities of the drainage facilities are exceeded. Therefore, the Proposed Project could result in significant flooding impacts.

WQ-5: Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not create or contribute to runoff in the City, and would therefore not adversely affect stormwater conveyance capacity or runoff quality.

Development of new or expanded facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would result in runoff from the sites that could contribute to runoff flows that exceed the capacity of existing

storm drains, if the storm drain capacities are constrained. Therefore, the Proposed Project could result in significant impacts to the storm drain system.

WQ-6: Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

No additional impacts to water quality are foreseen from the Proposed Project.

WQ-7: Place housing in a 100-year flood hazard area.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in the development of any new housing, and thus would not place housing in a 100-year floodplain.

Future new and/or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would be used only to process diverted materials from landfills or facilitate collection of recyclables, and would not include the development of any housing. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in the placement of any housing in a 100 year flood hazard area.

WQ-8: Place structures in a 100-year flood hazard area, which could impede or redirect flood flows.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in the development of any new structures, and thus would not place any structure in a 100-year floodplain.

If processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are proposed within a 100-year floodplain, there would be a remote potential for that facility to add to a flooding hazard that could redirect flood flows, which although remote, is still considered a potentially significant flood impact.

WQ-9: Expose people or structures to a significant risk from flooding due to failure of a levee or dam.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in the development of any new structures or housing that could involve risk of loss, injury or death from flooding.

Regarding expanded or new processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards within the City of Los Angeles, much of the potential inundation areas in the City are heavily urbanized and developed with residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Although new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, or truck base yards could be placed in a potential inundation area, these facilities would be designed to comply with applicable flood management and building code requirements to avoid exposing people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Potential inundation risks of future facilities are consistent with existing inundation risks throughout large portions of the City, and would not result in significant impacts.

For facilities outside the City, other general plans have safety elements that address potential safety risks, including potential failure of a dam or levee, future facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards under the Proposed Project are not expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

WQ-10: Inundate by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Although the collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur using existing urban infrastructure (streets and freeways), they would not result in development that could be inundated by seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. Such areas are not likely to be affected by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow due to lack of proximity to the ocean, large bodies of water, or hillsides subject to mudflows. For facilities near the coast, tsunami warning systems are in place to notify people in low-lying areas. Communities that could be impacted by tsunamis have evacuation routes identified. Given the planning measures that are in place with regard to a tsunami, in the event a future facility were located in a tsunami inundation area, it is anticipated that emergency systems would be activated in the event of a tsunami, and impacts would be less than significant.

4.9.2 Mitigation Measures***WQ-1: Violate any water quality standards.***

Mitigation measures WQ-1, WQ-2, and WQ-3, described in Section 3.2.6.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate potentially significant water quality impacts related to runoff from expanded or new facilities and truck base yards. Implementation of mitigation measure WQ-1 through WQ-3 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

WQ-2: Substantially deplete groundwater or interfere with groundwater recharge.

The Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant impacts related to groundwater depletion or interference with groundwater recharge. No mitigation is required.

WQ-3: Substantially alter drainage pattern in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation.

Mitigation measures WQ-4 and WQ-5, described in Section 3.2.6.7 of the Program EIR, would address potential drainage-related impacts related to runoff from expanded or new facilities and truck base yards. Implementation of mitigation measure WQ-4 and WQ-5 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

WQ-4: Substantially alter drainage pattern in a manner that would result in flooding.

Mitigation measures WQ-4 and WQ-5, described in Section 3.2.6.7 of the Program EIR, would address potential drainage-related impacts related to drainage pattern changes that could result in flooding from expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards. Implementation of mitigation measure WQ-4 and WQ-5 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

WQ-5: Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

Mitigation measures WQ-4, WQ-5, and WQ-6, described in Section 3.2.6.7 of the Program EIR, would address potential drainage-related impacts from expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards related to drainage pattern changes that could exceed downstream stormdrain capacity. Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-4, WQ-5, and WQ-5 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

WQ-6: Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

The Proposed Project would not otherwise degrade water quality and therefore would not result in significant impacts. No mitigation is required.

WQ-7: Place housing in a 100-year flood hazard area.

The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to placement of housing in a flood hazard area. No mitigation is required.

WQ-8: Place structures in a 100-year flood hazard area, which could impede or redirect flood flows.

Mitigation measures WQ-7, WQ-8, and WQ-9, described in Section 3.2.6.7 of the Program EIR, would address potential flood-related impacts from expanded or new facilities and truck base yards. Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-7, WQ-8, and WQ-9 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

WQ-9: Expose people or structures to a significant risk from flooding due to failure of a levee or dam.

The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to the failure of a levee or dam. No mitigation is required.

WQ-10: Inundate by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No mitigation is required.

4.9.3 Findings

For the above potential water quality impacts, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

- [] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measures WQ-1 through WQ-9, impacts related to the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in violations of water quality standards (Impact WQ-1), to result in drainage pattern changes that could in turn cause erosion (Impact WQ-3), to result in drainage pattern changes that could cause flooding (Impact WQ-4), to contribute runoff that could exceed the capacity of stormdrain systems (Impact WQ-5), and to result in flooding that could impede or alter flows (Impact WQ-8), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant [**XX**] **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.9.4 Rationale

Regarding the potential for expanded and new facilities to result in violations of water quality standards (Impact WQ-1), mitigation measure WQ-1 requires the identification of applicable water quality standards for receiving waters, and sets a performance standard of not violating those standard though the incorporation of measures into facility engineering documents. Mitigation measure WQ-2 requires compliance with the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, and the General Industrial Activity Stormwater Permit to keep potential discharges during construction and operation of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards from violating water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Mitigation measure WQ-3 further requires incorporation of BMPs during facility design to implement source control measures, including treatment BMPs. Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-1, WQ-2, and WQ-3 would mitigate potential impacts to water quality to less-than-significant levels.

Regarding potential drainage-related impacts (Impact WQ-3) and potential flooding-related impacts (Impact WQ-4), mitigation measure WQ-4 requires measures to reduce peak runoff flows from facility sites, and WQ-5 requires reducing impervious surfaces and adding natural areas to further reduce peak runoff. These measures are expected to reduce runoff from the new facility sites to below a level of significance.

Regarding potential drainage impacts on storm drain capacity (Impact WQ-5), in addition to mitigation measures WQ-4 and WQ-5, mitigation measure WQ-6 requires a study that evaluates the capacity of the storm drain system. If the system does not have adequate capacity, the evaluation would identify alternatives to safely convey site runoff without overburdening the

storm drain system. These measures are expected to reduce runoff from the new facility sites to below a level of significance.

Regarding potential flooding impacts of expanded and new facilities and truck base yards (Impact WQ-8), mitigation measure WQ-7 requires the preparation of a floodplain study during facility design to identify feasible measures to comply with FEMA water surface elevation requirements. Mitigation measures WQ-8 and WQ-9 require facility design features to avoid flood hazard areas or otherwise eliminate the flood hazard. These measures would mitigate potential impacts to below a level of significance.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.9.5 References

Section 3.2.6 of the Program EIR discusses the project's hydrology and water quality impacts and mitigation measures.

4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section discusses the anticipated land and planning impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.10-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated land use and planning impacts, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.10-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO LAND USE**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| LU-1: Established Community | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| LU-2: Land Use Plans and Zoning | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| LU-3: Habitat Conservation Plan | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.10.1 Description of Potential Effects

LU-1: Physically divide an established community.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development that would physically divide an established community.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses. As such, the expanded or new processing facilities and truck base yards on industrial lands are not expected to physically divide an established community. Siting Organics processing facilities on agricultural lands is not expected to divide an established community because such lands are typically established in the applicable General Plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in land use impacts that result from dividing an established community.

LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Proposed Project.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development or activities that would conflict with the General Plan.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses. Depending on the type of facility, potential impacts to land use would occur if a new or expanded transfer station, processing facility, or truck base yard was proposed in or near a residential land use, or where nearby land uses, residents, and/or businesses would be adversely affected by the day to day activities occurring at the facility (e.g., noise, intensity, traffic, and odor). If a proposed facility is not found to be compatible with the surrounding land uses at the time of proposal, a significant impact to land use and planning could occur. Therefore, new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new truck base yards could result in significant land use plan or policy impacts.

LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development, and would not occur in areas under a habitat management plan or natural community conservation plan.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses. Depending on the type of facility, potential impacts to land use would occur if a new or expanded transfer station, processing facility, or truck base yard was proposed in a location where a nearby conservation area would be adversely affected by the day to day activities occurring at the facility (e.g., noise, intensity, traffic, and odor). If a proposed facility is not found to be compatible with the surrounding land uses at the time of proposal, a significant impact to land use and planning could occur. Therefore, new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new truck base yards could result in significant land impacts related to potential conflicts with a habitat conservation plan or similar plan.

4.10.2 Mitigation Measures

LU-1: Physically divide an established community.

The Proposed Project would not divide an existing community, and therefore would not result in significant impacts. No mitigation is required.

LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Proposed Project.

Mitigation measures LU-1, LU-2, and LU-3, described in Section 3.2.7.7 of the Program EIR, would address potential land use conflicts that could result from expanded or new facilities and truck base yards. Implementation of mitigation measures LU-1, LU-2, and LU-3 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Mitigation measures LU-1, LU-2, and LU-3, described in Section 3.2.7.7 of the Program EIR, would address potential conflicts with a natural community conservation plan that could result from expanded or new facilities and truck base yards. Implementation of mitigation measures LU-1, LU-2, and LU-3 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

4.10.3 Findings

For the above potential land use impacts, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measures LU-1 through LU-3, impacts related to the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in conflicts with land use plans or policies (Impact LU-2), and in conflicts with habitat conservation plans (Impact LU-3), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant [**XX**] **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of

those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.10.4 Rationale

Regarding potential land use plan or policy conflicts (Impact LU-2) and potential conflict with a habitat conservation plan due to proximity (Impact LU-3), mitigation measure LU-1 requires that future facilities be consistent with the applicable general plan or other land use plan. Mitigation measure LU-2 requires future facilities shall be fully enclosed to the maximum extent practicable to minimize nuisance issues such as noise, odor and visual impact and achieve maximum compatibility with surrounding land uses, or requires operation changes to also minimize potential nuisances. Mitigation measure LU-3 requires facilities to be compatible with surrounding uses, including design, configuration, visual screening, setbacks, building heights, etc. These measures are expected to eliminate or reduce potential facility conflicts with existing land uses, land use plans and policies, and nearby habitat conservation plans to below a level of significance.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.10.5 References

Section 3.2.7 of the Program EIR discusses the Proposed Project's impacts on mineral resources, and mitigation measures.

4.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

This section discusses the anticipated impacts to mineral resource availability associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.11-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated mineral resource impacts, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.11-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO MINERAL RESOURCES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| MR-1: Loss of Mineral Resources to Region and State | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| MR-2: Loss of Locally Important Mineral Resources Recovery site | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.11.1 Description of Potential Effects

MR-1: Loss of availability of a mineral resource important to region or state.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development that could result in loss of availability of mineral resources (sand and gravel deposits in the Sun Valley and the Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon communities).

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas are designated in the City's General Plan and some sand and gravel deposits are located in the east San Fernando Valley, within industrial areas. As the specific locations of expanded or new processing facilities and truck base yards are unknown at this time, there is a potential for the future facilities to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource (including oil or gas) that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state is not known. If future sites include locations that contain mineral resources, such as areas mapped MRZ-2a, MRZ-2b, MRZ-3, MRZ-3a or MRZ-3b, there is a potential for a significant impact.

MR-2: Loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development that could result in loss of availability of mineral resources delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

The specific locations of expanded or new processing facilities and truck base yards are unknown at this time, and could occur in other jurisdictions. The potential for future facilities to 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 is dependent upon where these facilities are sited. Depending on the specific, yet-to- be-determined facility locations, the Proposed Project could result in a significant impact.

4.11.2 Mitigation Measures

MR-1: Loss of availability of a mineral resource important to region or state.

Mitigation measures MR-1, MR-2, MR-3, and MR-4, described in Section 3.2.8.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for loss of availability of mineral resource important to the region or State that could result from expanded or new facilities and truck base yards, depending on their location. Implementation of mitigation measures MR-1 through MR-4 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

MR-2: Loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource.

Mitigation measures MR-1, MR-2, MR-3, and MR-4, described in Section 3.2.8.7 of the Program EIR, would address potential impacts to locally important mineral resource availability that could result from expanded or new facilities and truck base yards, depending on their location. Implementation of mitigation measures MR-1 through MR-4 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

4.11.3 Findings

For the above impacts to mineral resources, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measures MR-1 through MR-4, impacts related to the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in the loss of availability of mineral resources important to the region or state (Impact MR-1), and/or to result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resources (Impact MR-2), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant [XX] **Not significant**

4.11.4 Rationale

Mitigation measures MR-1 through MR-4 are identified to keep future facilities from being sited on areas mapped as important mineral resources zones in state, region (Impact MR-1), or local jurisdictions (Impact MR-2), as well as avoiding and or preserving active oil, gas, geothermal operations and other mineral resources. With implementation of these mitigation measures, it is anticipated that project level impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.11.5 References

Section 3.2.8 of the Program EIR discusses the Proposed Project's impacts on mineral resources, and mitigation measures.

4.12 NOISE AND VIBRATION

This section discusses the anticipated noise and vibration impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.12-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated noise and vibration impacts, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.12-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO NOISE**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|---|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| NOI-1: Noise Standards | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| NOI-2: Groundborne Noise and Vibration | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| NOI-3: Permanent Noise Increases | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| NOI-4: Temporary Noise Increases | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| NOI-5: Excessive Noise Levels within 2 Miles of a Public Airport | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

**TABLE 4.12-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO NOISE**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|---|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| NOI-6: Excessive Noise Levels within the Vicinity of a Private Airport | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.12.1 Description of Potential Effects

NV-1: Noise levels in excess of established standards in the general plan or noise ordinance.

The proposed collection activities under the Proposed Project could result in some minor increases or decreases in weekly collection vehicle trips (relative to existing conditions) in each franchise zone, but the difference is considered minor, and collection activities would not substantively or noticeably change the existing noise levels (CNEL) in any area of the City. Therefore, collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in substantively increased noise that could result in an exceedence of recommended general plan noise levels.

Future new and/or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or commercial-manufacturing (due to the industrial nature of the facilities), or on lands zoned for agricultural uses (for Organics facilities). Due to the uncertainty of future facility locations and the current traffic level in those vicinities, there is a potential for future facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards to result in some permanent elevations in ambient noise from operations, including traffic noise, which could exceed established noise standards and is considered potentially significant.

NV-2: Excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project could result in some minor increases in vibration levels associated with a typical truck; however, the increase would be at or below the threshold of perception (RMS vibration velocity less than 65×10^{-6} inches per second). This minimal level of vibration is not expected to translate into noticeable levels of groundborne noise in nearby structures. As a result, collection activities under the Proposed Project are not expected to result in significant noise impacts from the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Future new and/or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or commercial-manufacturing (due to the industrial nature of the facilities), or on lands zoned for agricultural uses (for Organics facilities). Vibrations associated with processing activities and truck base yards would be consistent with those typically found in industrial and manufacturing areas. Further, although construction of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations and truck base could result in some vibrations and groundborne noise to nearby structures, the

potential vibration levels would likely be below levels that can cause damage to nearby structures. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant impacts due to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and significant impacts are not anticipated.

NV-3: Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

The proposed collection activities could result in some minor increases or decrease in weekly collection vehicle trips (relative to existing conditions) in each franchise zone, but the difference is considered minor. For a community noise level increase to be noticeable, the CNEL would generally have to increase by 3 dBA, which would require a doubling of the noise source. The change in collection activity trips relative to baseline would be minor and would not approach a doubling of the existing traffic, and therefore, would not substantively or noticeably change the existing noise levels (CNEL) in any area of the City. Therefore, collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in substantial permanent increase in noise levels.

Future new and/or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or commercial-manufacturing (due to the industrial nature of the facilities), or on lands zoned for agricultural uses (for Organics facilities). Due to the uncertainty of future facility locations and the current traffic level in those vicinities, there is a potential for future facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards to result in some permanent elevations in ambient noise from operations, including traffic noise. Therefore, there is a potential for new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards to result in significant permanent increases in noise levels.

NV-4: Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity

The collection activities under the Proposed Project could result in some minor increases in weekly collection vehicle trips (relative to existing conditions) as collection vehicles traverse their service areas (franchise zones), and transfer Solid Resources, Recyclables, or Organics from their bins to the trucks, but these activities would be of very short duration (several minutes) and would occur only once a week for each bin type. These short duration noise increases are consistent with existing Solid Resource collection activities that occur throughout the City, and are expected to be consistent with the City's noise regulations. Therefore, short duration elevations in noise related to materials transfer from bins to collection vehicles would not represent a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

Future new and/or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or commercial-manufacturing (due to the industrial nature of the facilities), or on lands zoned for agricultural uses (for Organics facilities). However, due to the uncertainty of future facility locations, if a future facility, transfer station, or truck base yard is sited in an area that also has sensitive receptors in the vicinity, there is a potential for construction to result in a significant noise impact on those receptors.

NV-5: Exposure to excessive noise levels if the project is located in close proximity to a public airport.

Collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur from establishments located within 2 miles of a public airport; however, collection would not result in substantially elevated ambient noise levels, as described above, and would not result in changes in airport noise contours. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the vicinity of a public use airport to excessive noise levels.

Processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are not expected to occur within an airport land use plan area, but could occur within 2 miles of an airport if industrial zones are located in their vicinity. If future facilities are placed within high noise level contours from a public airport, there is a possibility of people working in the facility to be exposed to airport-related noise, potentially resulting in a significant noise impact.

NV-6: Exposure to excessive noise levels if the project is located in close proximity to a private airport.

Collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur from establishments located within 2 miles of a private airport; however, collection would not result in substantially elevated ambient noise levels, as described above, and would not result in changes in airport noise contours. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airport to excessive noise levels.

Processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are not expected to occur within an airport land use plan area, but could occur within 2 miles of an airport if industrial zones are located in their vicinity. If future facilities are placed within high noise level contours from a private airport, there is a possibility of people working in the facility to be exposed to airport-related noise, potentially resulting in a significant noise impact.

4.12.2 Mitigation Measures

NV-1: Noise levels in excess of established standards in the general plan or noise ordinance.

Mitigation measures N-1 and N-7, described in Section 3.2.9.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for future facilities to result in noise levels in excess of applicable noise standards. Implementation of mitigation measures N-1 and N-7 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

NV-2: Excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

The Proposed Project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise, therefore would not result in significant impacts. No mitigation is required.

NV-3: Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

Mitigation measures N-1 and N-7, described in Section 3.2.9.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for future facilities to result in substantial permanent increases in ambient

noise levels. Implementation of mitigation measures N-1 and N-7 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

NV-4: Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity

Mitigation measures N-1 through N-8, described in Section 3.2.9.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for construction of future facilities to result in substantial temporary increases in ambient noise levels if sensitive receptors are located nearby. Implementation of mitigation measures N-1 through N-8 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

NV-5: Exposure to excessive noise levels if the project is located in close proximity to a public airport.

Mitigation measure N-8, described in Section 3.2.9.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for construction of future facilities to result in exposure of people to elevated noise levels if the new facilities would be located within close proximity to a public use airport. Implementation of mitigation measure N-8 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

NV-6: Exposure to excessive noise levels if the project is located in close proximity to a private airport.

Mitigation measure N-8, described in Section 3.2.9.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for construction of future facilities to result in exposure of people to elevated noise levels if the new facilities would be located within close proximity to a private airport. Implementation of mitigation measure N-8 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

4.12.3 Findings

For the above noise and vibration impacts, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measures N-1 through N-8, impacts related to the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in noise levels in excess of established standards

(Impact NOI-1), to result in substantial permanent increases in ambient noise levels (Impact NOI-3), to result in substantial temporary increases in ambient noise levels (Impact NOI-4), to result in the exposure of persons to elevated noise levels if the facility would be located close to a public airport (Impact NOI- 5), and to result in the exposure of persons to elevated noise levels if the facility would be located close to a private airport (Impact NOI- 6), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant [**XX**] **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.12.4 Rationale

Regarding the potential for expanded and new processing facilities and truck base yards to generate noise in excess of established standards (Impact NOI-1) and to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels (Impact NOI-3), mitigation measure N-1 requires the preparation of a project-specific noise analysis once a facility has been proposed at a specific location. The project-specific noise analysis would determine the existing noise environment. It would also use project-specific traffic data to characterize the increase of the ambient noise environment due to the addition of traffic coming to and from the facility. Mitigation measure N-1 also requires further mitigation measures be implemented to reduce sound levels down to a level that is consistent with the applicable jurisdiction's noise ordinance or noise element. Mitigation Measure N-7 requires operational noise levels from future facilities to not exceed the applicable community noise standards at the property line for future facilities, transfer stations and truck base yards. These mitigation measures are expected to mitigate potential noise impacts to less than significant levels.

Regarding the potential of construction of expanded and new processing facilities and truck base yards to generate excessive temporary or periodic elevations in noise levels if sensitive receptors are located nearby (Impact NOI-4), implementation of mitigation measures N-1 through N-6 would mitigate construction noise. These measures require a project-specific noise study, limiting construction to the daytime hours, providing temporary barriers near sensitive receiving properties, and ensuring that construction equipment is adequately maintained and muffled. These mitigation measures are expected to mitigate potential noise impacts to less than significant levels.

Regarding the potential for exposure of people to elevated noise levels if new facilities are located within 2-miles of a public use airport (Impact NOI-5) or a private airport (Impact NOI-6), mitigation measure N-8 requires the preparation of a project-specific noise study to include an analysis of the potential for the facility's adjacency to an airport to result in exposure of employees to excessive noise levels. If excessive noise levels are identified, mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce the interior noise levels to acceptable and applicable community noise levels. Implementation of mitigation measure N-8 would reduce this potential impact to below a level of significance.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.12.5 References

Section 3.2.9 of the Program EIR discusses the Proposed Project's noise and vibration impacts and mitigation measures.

4.13 POPULATION, HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT

This section discusses the impacts to population and housing associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.13-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts to population and housing, based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.13-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO POPULATION AND HOUSING**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| PH-1: Population Growth | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| PH-2: Existing Housing | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| PH-3: Existing Residents | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.13.1 Description of Potential Effects

PH-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development that could induce substantial population growth.

The development of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely result in the creation of some additional jobs, which could result in a slight increase in demand for housing. However, the number of additional jobs created would be small. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to induce substantial population growth.

PH-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur in developed areas of the City using existing infrastructure, and would not result in removal or displacement of any existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan and generally preclude residences. It is unlikely that housing within the City would be demolished to accommodate future new or expanded facilities.

However, outside the City, there is the possibility that lands zoned for industrial or agricultural uses could contain residences. As a consequence, if the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards would be located on lands zoned for industrial uses or agriculture that contain residences, they could result in adverse impacts to existing housing from construction-related disturbances and site development, which is a potentially significant impact.

PH-3: Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur within developed areas of the City using existing infrastructure, and is not expected to result in removal or displacement of people that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan and generally preclude residences. It is unlikely that people or residences within the City would be demolished to accommodate future new or expanded facilities.

However, outside the City, there is the possibility that people reside on lands zoned for industrial or agricultural uses. As a consequence, if the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards would be located on lands zoned for industrial uses or agriculture uses that house people, they could result in adverse impacts to existing housing from construction-related disturbances and site development, which is a potentially significant impact.

4.13.2 Mitigation Measures

PH-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area.

The Proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth, and therefore would not result in significant impacts. No mitigation is required.

PH-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2, described in Section 3.2.10.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards (outside of the City) to displace substantial number of housing. Implementation of mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

PH-3: Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2, described in Section 3.2.10.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards (outside of the City) to displace substantial number of people. Implementation of mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

4.13.3 Findings

For the above impacts to population and housing, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2, impacts related to the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to displace housing (Impact PH-2) and to displace people (Impact PH-3), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant [**XX**] **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.13.4 Rationale

Regarding the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards (outside of the City) to displace substantial numbers of housing (Impact PH-2), and the potential to displace a

substantial number of people (Impact PH-3), under mitigation measure PH-1, property owners shall be appropriately compensated, and displaced people shall be relocated, if future new or expanded facilities result in the displacement of existing residential units. Further, under mitigation measure PH-2, all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding acquisition of property, compensation to displaced property owners or tenants, and relocation assistance and benefits for persons who may be displaced shall be adhered to or exceeded, if acquisition of public or private residences are necessary. Implementation of mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2 would mitigate the adverse impacts to below a level of significance if displacement of housing or people were to occur.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.13.5 References

Section 3.2.10 of the Program EIR discusses the Proposed Project's impacts on population and housing, and mitigation measures.

4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

This section discusses the impacts to public services associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.14-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts to public services based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.14-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO PUBLIC SERVICES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|---|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| PS-1: Fire Protection Facilities | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| PS-2: Police Protection Facilities | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| PS-3: Schools | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |

**TABLE 4.14-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO PUBLIC SERVICES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| PS-4: Park Facilities | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| PS-5: Other Public Facilities | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |

4.14.1 Description of Potential Effects

PS-1: Require new or physically altered fire protection facilities.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur within developed areas of the City using existing infrastructure, and would not result in the need for new or altered fire protection facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.

New or expanded facilities and truck base yards would be subject to standard code compliance reviews that occur during the building permit process, and these reviews ensure that applicable fire, life, and safety code requirements are complied with. Compliance with applicable sections of the Fire Code and the California Fire Code is expected to keep future processing facilities and base yards from resulting in the need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.

PS-2: Require new or physically altered police protection facilities.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development or increased population that could increase demand for police protection services. Therefore, collection activities under the Proposed Project would not require the need for, or the provision of, new or physically altered police protection facilities.

New processing capacity and base yards would likely be added in areas already within established police service areas; and the relatively benign nature of the processing facilities and base yards are not expected to substantively increase demand for police services or the need for new or expanded police protection facilities.

PS-3: Require new or physically altered schools.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could significantly increase demand for school services. Therefore, collection activities under the Proposed Project would not require the need for or the provision of new or physically altered schools.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial or commercial manufacturing

uses, or agricultural uses. At the time a new facility is proposed, the developer will be required to pay school fees appropriate for commercial or industrial development. Payment of the applicable fees would keep potential impacts to schools below a level of significance.

PS-4: Require new or physically altered park facilities.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development that could substantively increase demand for park, which could in turn require new or expanded park facilities.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial or commercial manufacturing uses, or agricultural uses. Development is not anticipated to result in any park development or increased population that could significantly affect park facilities.

PS-5: Require new or physically altered public facilities.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that could substantively increase demand for other public facilities, which could in turn require their expansion or new public facilities.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial or commercial manufacturing uses, or agricultural uses. The facilities would only create a small number of jobs, which would be too small to increase demand for other public services, which could in turn require their expansion or the need for new public facilities.

4.14.2 Mitigation Measures

PS-1: Require new or physically altered fire protection facilities.

The Proposed Project would not require new fire protection facilities or alterations to existing facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

PS-2: Require new or physically altered police protection facilities.

The Proposed Project would not require new police protection facilities or alterations to existing facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

PS-3: Require new or physically altered schools.

The Proposed Project would not require new schools or alterations to existing facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

PS-4: Require new or physically altered park facilities.

The Proposed Project would not require new park facilities or alterations to existing facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

PS-5: Require new or physically altered public facilities.

The Proposed Project would not require new park or recreational facilities, or alterations to existing facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

4.14.3 Findings

No findings are made regarding impacts to public service impacts, as anticipated public service impacts would be minimal and less than significant.

4.14.4 Rationale

No rationale is provided herein regarding public service impact findings pursuant to Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, as anticipated public service impacts would be less than significant.

4.14.5 References

Section 3.2.11 of the Program EIR discusses the Proposed Project's impacts to public services.

4.15 RECREATION AND PARKS

This section discusses the impacts to recreation associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.15-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts to recreation based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.15-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO RECREATION**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| REC-1: | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| REC-2: | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.15.1 Description of Potential Effects

REC-1: Increase the use of existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in development that could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, or otherwise cause deterioration of existing recreational facilities.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial or commercial manufacturing uses, or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas are designated in the applicable General Plan and are generally not located close to recreational facilities. In addition, industrial uses are not generators of demand for recreational uses; rather, demand for recreation is linked to residential uses, which would not be increased by the Proposed Project. As such, the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities, truck base yards on industrial or agricultural lands would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, or otherwise cause deterioration of existing recreational facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated.

REC-2: Require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in any development, including the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial or commercial manufacturing uses, or agricultural uses. Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan and are generally not located close to recreational facilities. It is unlikely that recreational facilities would be impacted to accommodate future new or expanded facilities within the City.

However, the locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time; if future facilities are constructed near land zoned for recreational use, a potentially significant impact could occur. Additionally, outside of the City, there is the possibility that future new or expanded facilities could be constructed in an area that currently supports recreation. As a consequence, if the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities, or truck base yards would be located on or near lands that support recreation, they could result in direct or indirect impacts to recreation from construction-related disturbances and site development, and potentially require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities elsewhere that might have an adverse physical impact on the environment. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

4.15.2 Mitigation Measures

REC-1: Increase the use of existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur.

The Proposed Project would not require new park or recreational facilities, or alterations to existing facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

REC-2: Require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Mitigation measure REC-1, described in Section 3.2.11.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in impacts to recreation. Implementation of mitigation measures REC-1 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

4.15.3 Findings

For the above impacts to recreational resources, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measure REC-1, impacts related to the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in impacts to (Impact REC-2), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant [**XX**] **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.15.4 Rationale

Regarding the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in adverse impacts to recreation (Impact REC-2), mitigation measure REC-1 requires replacement recreation facilities to be acquired or constructed in the general vicinity prior to demolition of

existing recreational facilities, if future facilities are located on a site that results in an impact to existing recreation facilities. This measure is expected to mitigate the adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.15.5 References

Section 3.2.11 of the Draft EIR addressed the Proposed Project's recreational impacts and mitigation measures.

4.16 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

This section discusses the impacts to transportation associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.16-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts to transportation based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.16-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC RESOURCES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| TR-1: Plans, Policies or Ordinances | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| TR-2: Congestion Management Program | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| TR-3: Air Traffic Patterns | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| TR-4: Design Hazards | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |

**TABLE 4.16-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC RESOURCES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|---|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| TR-5: Emergency Access | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| TR-6: Alternative Transportation | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |

4.16.1 Description of Potential Effects

TR-1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would result in small changes in traffic volumes throughout the system (both better and worse). The estimated changes in hauler vehicle miles traveled or VMT (a 2 percent decrease) and vehicle hours traveled or VHT (a 10 percent increase) by 2030 are relatively small changes for a small subset of the vehicles on the road dispersed over a large area. Existing VHT citywide (for vehicles and trucks) is estimated to be 989 million vehicle hours per year. By 2035, the VHT is expected to increase to 1.14 billion vehicle hours per year. The overall increase in project-related VHT (approximately 81,200 hours) represents a change in overall VHT in the City of less than 0.01 percent. The changes in VMT and VHT are not expected to result in a substantial increase in traffic or any change in operations. Therefore, collection activities are not expected to result in significant traffic impacts, and would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness regarding alternative transportation.

Specific locations and trip generation estimates for the future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new or expanded truck base yards have not been identified at this time. Therefore, depending on the trip generation and distribution associated with the future facilities, there is a potential for the project-added traffic to result in localized impacts to the road network, which consequently, may conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Impacts associated with the future facilities are considered potentially significant.

TR-2: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

As discussed under TR-1 above, the changes in VMT and VHT from the collection activities under the Proposed Project are not expected to result in a substantial increase in traffic or any change in operations. Therefore, collection activities are not expected to result in significant traffic impacts, and would not conflict with an applicable congestion management plan.

Specific locations and trip generation estimates for the future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new or expanded truck base yards have not been identified at this time. Therefore, depending on the trip generation and distribution associated with the

future facilities, there is a potential for the project-added traffic to result in localized impacts to the road network, which consequently, may conflict with an applicable congestion management plan. Therefore, impacts associated with the future facilities are considered potentially significant

TR-3: Result in a change in air traffic patterns that results in substantial safety risks.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. It would not result in an increase in air travel, nor would it change the location of travel so as to result in a substantial safety risk. The Proposed Project would have no effect on air traffic patterns. No impacts are expected.

TR-4: Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature.

Although the collection activities under the Proposed Project would result in the diversion of materials (Commingled Recyclables and Organics) from landfills, these collection activities would occur on and from Commercial Establishments, using existing urban infrastructure (streets and freeways) in the City, and similar collection methods. Therefore, the collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in significant transportation impacts.

The locations of potential future facilities are not known at this time. The siting and design of the facilities would require review and approval from the appropriate reviewing agency and must incorporate proper design principles that avoid hazards due to sharp curves or dangerous intersections, including but not limited to site ingress and egress. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the facilities would be located in an area that causes hazards due to incompatible uses. Impacts from future facilities are considered less than significant.

TR-5: Result in inadequate emergency access.

Vehicles collecting Solid Resources under the Proposed Project would be traveling on public streets and along routes already used routinely by such vehicles; therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant design hazard or significant impact to emergency access.

The locations of potential future facilities are not known at this time. However, the siting and design of the facilities would require review and approval from the appropriate reviewing agency and must incorporate proper design principles that avoid hazards due to sharp curves or dangerous intersections, including but not limited to site ingress and egress. Therefore, future facilities would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts from future facilities are considered less than significant.

TR-6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

Vehicles collecting Solid Resources under the Proposed Project would be traveling on public streets and along routes already used routinely by such vehicles, and no changes to or increase in demand for alternative transportation would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation.

Depending on the location of future facilities, they may be located adjacent to transit stops, bike routes, and pedestrian paths. The jurisdiction processing the permits to construct the facility would review the site plan and improvements to ensure that there is adequate access to any existing alternative transportation facilities. Additionally, a traffic control plan would be required should construction of the facilities result in temporary road closures that could impact bus, pedestrian, or bicycle routes. Therefore, impacts related to alternative transportation during both the construction and operation phase for future facilities are considered less than significant.

4.16.2 Mitigation Measures

TR-1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

Mitigation measure TR-1, described in Section 3.1.4.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in potentially significant traffic impacts that could result in conflicts with an applicable plan or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Implementation of mitigation measures TR-1 would lessen potentially significant traffic impacts, but may not do so to a level of significance. As a consequence, significant traffic impacts related to future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new or expanded truck base yard could still remain.

TR-2: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

Mitigation measure TR-1, described in Section 3.1.4.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in potentially significant traffic impacts that could result in conflicts with a congestion management plan (Impact TR-2). Implementation of mitigation measures TR-1 would lessen potentially significant traffic impacts, but may not do so to a level of significance. As a consequence, significant traffic impacts related to future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new or expanded truck base yard could still remain.

TR-3: Result in a change in air traffic patterns that results in substantial safety risks.

The Proposed Project would not result in impacts to air traffic patterns. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

TR-4: Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature.

The Proposed Project would not result in impacts related to traffic hazards from design features. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

TR-5: Result in inadequate emergency access.

The Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

TR-6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

The Proposed Project would not result conflicts with alternative transportation plans or policies. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

4.16.3 Findings

For the above impacts to transportation, the following finding is made:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measure TR-1, potential impacts related to expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in significant traffic impacts that could result in a conflict with applicable traffic plans and policies establishing measures of effectiveness regarding (Impact TR-1), or to result in conflicts with an applicable congestion management plan (Impact TR-2), are found to be:

[XX] Potentially Significant [] Not significant

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.16.4 Rationale

Regarding the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in significant traffic impacts that could result in a conflict with applicable traffic plans and policies establishing measures of effectiveness regarding (Impact TR-1), or result in conflicts with an applicable congestion management plan (Impact TR-2), implementation of mitigation measure

TR-1 will require preparation of a traffic impact report and identification of mitigation once a future project site is identified. However, since the specific locations of expanded or future facilities are not known and the conditions of the roadway network adjacent to the future sites cannot be determined, it cannot be conclusively stated at this time that all potential traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Thus, impacts are considered potentially significant and unavoidable.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.16.5 References

Section 3.1.4 of the Draft EIR addressed the Proposed Project's recreational impacts and mitigation measures.

4.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

This section discusses the impacts to utilities and service systems associated with the Proposed Project.

Table 4.17-1 provides a summary of the Proposed Project's anticipated impacts to utilities and services systems based on the evaluation in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 4.17-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO UTILITIES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| UT-1: Wastewater Treatment Requirements | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| UT-2: Water/Wastewater Treatment Facilities | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| UT-3: Stormwater Drainage Facilities | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| UT-4: Water Supply | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

**TABLE 4.17-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS RELATED TO UTILITIES**

| Environmental Impact Area | Potential Impact | Mitigation | Significant Impact After Mitigation |
|--|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| UT-5: Wastewater Treatment Capacity | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |
| UT-6: Landfill Capacity | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| UT-7: Solid Waste Regulations | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | No | None Required | No |
| UT-8: Energy | | | |
| Collection System | No | None Required | No |
| New or Expanded Facilities | Yes | Yes | No |

4.17.1 Description of Potential Effects

UT-1: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would occur within developed areas of the City using existing infrastructure, and would not result in discharges of wastewater, or any cause new development that could discharge wastewater.

Future new or expanded processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses, which are generally served by sewer systems that convey wastewater to one or more wastewater treatment or water reclamation plants that serve the City and the surrounding areas. Facilities sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses could require use of alternative wastewater disposal systems such as septic systems due the lack of nearby sewer lines. Wastewater generated in the City by new processing capacity and truck base yards would be consistent with wastewater generated within each wastewater treatment service area, and is not expected to result in exceedences of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB that issues the effluent discharge permits for City wastewater treatment and water reclamation plants. For future new or expanded facilities sited outside the City, wastewater treatment requirements would be determined based on the individual jurisdiction and RWQCB of that jurisdiction. As future facilities are proposed, they would be subject to additional review pursuant to CEQA. Part of that analysis would include a review of wastewater infrastructure and demand. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to result exceedences of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB that issues the effluent discharge permits for City wastewater treatment and water reclamation plants.

UT-2: Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

The collection under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that would result in the need to construct new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities.

Future new or expanded processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses or commercial manufacturing uses, which are generally served by sewer systems that convey wastewater to one or more wastewater treatment or water reclamation plants that serve the City and the surrounding areas. Facilities sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses could require use of alternative wastewater disposal systems such as septic systems due the lack of nearby sewer lines. There is currently adequate wastewater treatment capacity within the City's treatment plant service areas to accommodate wastewater flows.

Furthermore, LADWP has adequate water supplies to accommodate the water demand in the City for the 25-year planning horizon under the UWMP.

For new or expanded facilities sited outside the City, wastewater treatment capacity and water demand would be determined based on the individual jurisdiction, and each water purveyor is required to prepare a UWMP every 5 years. If the facility is sited in an area consistent with the general plan land use designation for that jurisdiction, it is presumed that water supply would be sufficient. However, the locations of future facilities are unknown at this time; future new or expanded processing facilities, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities could necessitate the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

UT-3: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that would result in the need to construct new storm drainage facilities or expand existing facilities.

The locations of future facilities are unknown at this time; however, future new or expanded facilities outside the City would be required to comply with all local, state, and federal stormwater discharge requirements, as well as applicable NPDES permits. Nonetheless, future new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities could contribute to runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

UT-4: Not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that would increase water use or result in the need to secure new water supplies.

Future new or expanded processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses, commercial manufacturing uses, or agricultural uses. If the facility is sited in an area consistent with the general plan land use designation for that jurisdiction, it is presumed that water supply would be sufficient. However, the locations of future facilities are unknown at this time; future new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could be located in an area that would result in the need to secure new water supplies, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

UT-5: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it does not have adequate capacity.

The collection activities under the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes or new development that would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment service provider that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the Proposed Project's projected wastewater treatment demand.

Future new or expanded processing facilities, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses, commercial manufacturing uses, or agricultural uses. If the facility is sited in an area consistent with the general plan land use designation for that jurisdiction, it is presumed that water supply would be sufficient. However, the locations of future facilities are unknown at this time; future new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards could necessitate the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

UT-6: Be served by a landfill without sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project's Solid Waste disposal needs.

Elements of the Proposed Project (see Section 2.4) include diversion targets for Commingled Recyclables and Organics, landfill reduction targets and/or disposal limits, preservation and expansion of existing Organics collection, and fair and equitable rate structure, all of which facilitate a reduction in the amounts of Solid Waste that would be disposed of in landfills over time. These elements would have the effect of prolonging landfill capacity.

The baseline landfill capacity reduction condition is one where total remaining landfill capacity is being reduced by approximately 7,600 tons per day of waste generated in the City. The Proposed Project would have the effect of slowing down the baseline landfill capacity reduction condition by substantially lowering the amount of wastes generated that need to be disposed of in a landfill to below the existing Solid Waste disposal tonnage of 7,600 tons per day. As a consequence, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to Solid Waste landfill capacity.

UT-7: Not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

The Proposed Project would result in the diversion of materials (Commingled Recyclables and Organics) from landfills and is expected to meet the landfill diversion level required in the California Integrated Waste Management Act and AB 341. In addition, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the Los Angeles County Countywide Integrated Waste Management

Plan, RENEW L.A. Zero Waste Goals, and the Infrastructure and Public Services Element of the City's General Plan. Therefore, collection activities, and new or expanded processing capacity and truck base yards under the Proposed Project would not conflict with statutes or regulations related to Solid Resources.

UT-8: Require new (off-site) energy supply facilities or not incorporate energy conservation measures into facility design or operations.

New or expanded materials processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would utilize energy for facility operations. Although the new or expanded facilities are not expected to result in intensive energy demands, a potentially significant energy impact is identified to ensure that energy efficiency and conservation are incorporated into the facilities.

4.17.2 Mitigation Measures

UT-1: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The Proposed Project would not generate wastewater that exceeds the treatment requirements of the regional water quality control boards. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

UT-2: Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2, described in Section 3.2.13.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential need to secure for new water supplies to support expanded or new facilities and truck base yards. Implementation of mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

UT-3: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-4, WQ-5, and WQ-6, described in Section 3.2.6.7 of the Program EIR, would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

UT-4: Not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources.

Mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2, described in Section 3.2.13.7 of the Program EIR, would address the potential need to secure new water supplies to support expanded or new facilities and truck base yards. Implementation of mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

UT-5: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it does not have adequate capacity.

Mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2, described in Section 3.2.13.7 of the Program EIR, would address the wastewater treatment capacity issues of expanded or new facilities and truck base yards in the event a wastewater provider determines that it does not have capacity to serve the facilities. Implementation of mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2 would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

UT-6: Be served by a landfill without sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project's Solid Waste disposal needs.

The Proposed Project would directly reduce the amount of solid waste diverted from landfills and prolong remaining landfill capacity. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

UT-7: Not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

The Proposed Project would directly reduce the amount of solid waste diverted from landfills and prolong remaining landfill capacity. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with solid waste laws, regulations and plans, and would not result in significant impacts. No mitigation is required.

UT-8: Require new (off-site) energy supply facilities or not incorporate energy conservation measures into facility design or operations.

Mitigation measures UT-3, described in Section 3.2.13.7 of the Program EIR, would require energy efficiency measures in expanded or new facilities and truck base yards and would mitigate the potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

4.17.3 Findings

For the above impacts to utilities, the following finding is made:

- [XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.**
- [] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With mitigation measure UT-1, UT-2, UT-3, WQ-4, WQ-5, and WQ-6, impacts related to expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to require new water supplies (Impact UT-2 and UT-4), to adversely affect storm drain capacity (Impact UT-3), to address inadequate wastewater treatment capacity (Impact UT-5), and to require the energy efficiency design features (Impact UT-8), are found to be:

[] Potentially Significant [**XX**] **Not significant**

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.17.4 Rationale

Regarding the potential for expanded or new facilities and truck base yards to result in a need to secure new water supplies (Impact UT-2 and Impact UT-4), mitigation measure UT-1 and UT-2 would be implemented. Under mitigation measure UT-1, future processing facilities would incorporate water conservation design features, including water-efficient landscaping, use of recycled water for irrigation and truck-washing, and high-efficiency water fixtures. Under mitigation measure UT-2, development applications for future new facilities greater than 40 acres of land, having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area, or employing more than 1,000 persons would include a water supply assessment. These measures are expected to mitigate potential water supply impacts to a level below significance.

Regarding the potential for new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, or truck base yards to contribute to runoff that exceeds the capacity of the storm drain system (Impact UT-3), mitigation measures WQ-4, WQ-5, and WQ-6, described in Section 2.9.2 of this Findings of Fact document, would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

Regarding the potential for a wastewater service provider to determine that adequate capacity to serve the new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, or truck base yards is not available (Impact UT-5), implementation of mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2 focus on water reduction, which has the effect of reducing wastewater generation. These measures are expected to minimize wastewater generation and facilitate a determination of adequate capacity. Impacts are expected to be below a level of significance.

Regarding the energy conservations measure (Impact UT-8), mitigation measure UT-3 would require the incorporation of energy efficient design features, which would mitigate the impact to below significance.

The mitigation measures in the Program EIR apply to new or expanded facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards. The locations of the expanded or new facilities and truck base yards are unknown and could occur outside of the City of Los Angeles (within the jurisdiction of another CEQA Lead Agency). Further site-specific environmental documentation is expected to be prepared by the Lead Agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located, when the new or expanded facilities are better defined.

4.17.5 References

Section 3.2.13 of the Draft EIR addressed the Proposed Project's impacts on utilities, and mitigation measures.

4.18 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This section discusses the cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

4.18.1 Description of Potential Effects

Under the Proposed Project, the collection activities would not make cumulatively considerable contributions to significant cumulative impacts. The potential for the Proposed Project to make cumulatively considerable contributions to significant cumulative impacts is related to the future expanded and new processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yard, the locations of which are not currently known. Cumulative effects associated with the Proposed Project would include the following:

- Aesthetic Resources: If future facilities are sited in close proximity to related projects and in the vicinity of a scenic vista, scenic highway, or other aesthetic resource, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact to aesthetic resources. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.
- Agricultural Resources: If future facilities are sited in close proximity to related projects and both affect agricultural resources, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact to agricultural resources. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.
- Air Quality: Construction and operation of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, or truck base yards could result in emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Additionally, future stationary source emissions from the facilities would further contribute to exceedences to the SCAQMD thresholds, in conjunction with emissions from related projects. Therefore, the Proposed Project could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative air quality impact. Mitigation has been proposed that would lessen the facility emissions; however, residual impacts that contribute to a significant cumulative air quality impact could remain. Therefore, the Proposed Project could contribute to an unavoidable significant cumulative impact to air quality.
- Biological Resources: If future facilities are sited in close proximity to related projects and adversely affect biological resources, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact to biological resources. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.
- Cultural Resources: If future facilities are sited in close proximity to related projects and both affect cultural resources, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact to cultural resources. Mitigation has been proposed that would reduce the Project's contribution, and for archaeological resources and paleontological resources, would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance. For historic resources, the residual impacts that contribute to a significant cumulative impact to

historic resources could remain. Therefore, the Proposed Project could contribute to an unavoidable significant cumulative impact to historic resources.

- Geology and Soils: Future facilities under the Proposed Project, as well as related projects, would have to comply with general requirements that would dictate siting and design requirements for new or expanded facilities (and related projects), which are expected to keep potential cumulative impacts geology and soils at a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact to geology and soils.
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions: The incremental GHG emissions from the future facilities under the Proposed Project would make a cumulative contribution to global climate change, which is considered potentially significant. Mitigation has been proposed that would lessen the generation of GHG emissions from future facilities; however, residual impacts that contribute to a significant cumulative GHG emission impact could remain. Therefore, the Proposed Project could contribute to an unavoidable significant cumulative impact related to GHG emissions.
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials: If future facilities are sited in close proximity to related projects and result in hazards or hazardous materials impacts, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.
- Hydrology and Water Quality: The Proposed Project and related project facilities would have to comply with general NPDES permits, SWPPPs, MS4 NPDES Permit, and runoff BMPs, which are expected to keep potential cumulative impacts to water quality and drainage patterns at a less-than-significant level. Project-level mitigation would further reduce any potential to contribute to cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact to geology and soils.
- Land Use: If future facilities under the Proposed Project and other related projects are sited such that they fall under the same land use framework, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact to land use. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.
- Mineral Resources: If future facilities under the Proposed Project and other related projects are sited such that they affect availability of the same mineral resource, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact to mineral resource availability. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.
- Noise and Vibration: If future facilities are sited in close proximity to related projects and constructed or operated concurrently, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative noise impact. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.
- Population and Housing: If future facilities under the Proposed Project and other related projects are sited such that they would displace units of the same housing stock or residents of the same jurisdiction, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact to population and housing. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.

- **Public Services:** Future facilities under the Proposed Project, as well as related projects, would have to pay developer impact fees to offset impacts resulting from the respective project. Payment of the fees would keep potential impacts of new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards, to below a level of significance. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact to public services.
- **Recreation:** If future facilities under the Proposed Project and other related projects are sited such that they affect the same recreational resource or recreational resources in the same areas, the Proposed Project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact to recreation. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.
- **Utilities:** If future facilities under the Proposed Project and other related projects are sited such that they affect the same water supplier or wastewater provider and those services cannot be met using existing infrastructure, the projects could result in impacts to utilities and service systems. However, mitigation has been proposed that would mitigate the contribution to below a level of significance.
- **Transportation:** Depending on the locations of future facilities, there is a potential that facilities under the Proposed Project and other related projects could result in significant cumulative traffic impacts. Although mitigation has been required, it cannot be determined at this time whether future traffic impacts would be fully mitigated; therefore, after mitigation, the Proposed Project could contribute to an unavoidable significant cumulative impact to transportation.

4.18.2 Mitigation Measures

Implementation of project-level mitigation, described above, is the only feasible mitigation that can reduce both project-level impacts and cumulative impacts. Because the potentially significant cumulative impacts all involve future facilities, whose locations are unknown, there is no way to identify other mitigation at this time that may be feasible. It should be noted that once new facilities are proposed, they would be subject to further CEQA evaluation by the Lead Agency with jurisdiction over the project, and additional mitigation may be developed that time.

4.18.3 Findings

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

[] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

[] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

With project-level mitigation, the above potential cumulative impacts related to aesthetic resources, agricultural resources, biological resource, cultural resources (archeological and paleontological resources), hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, recreation, and utilities, are found to be:

[XX] Significant [XX] **Not significant**

With project-level mitigation, the above potential cumulative impacts related to air quality, cultural resources (historic resources), greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation, are found to be

[XX] **Significant** [XX] Not significant

For future facilities that would be located outside of the City of Los Angeles, changes in or alterations to the future facilities that avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of those facilities are within the exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies and not the City of Los Angeles. Such changes can and should be adopted by the other public agencies.

4.18.4 Rationale

For resources with cumulative impacts that would be reduced to a level below significance, project-level mitigation would reduce the project's contribution to potentially significant impacts to below a level that is considered to be cumulatively considerable. As a result, cumulative impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

Cumulative air quality impacts could be potentially significant due to concurrent construction or operation of different projects in close proximity to one another, that result in emissions that exceed the SCAQMD significance criteria, and which cannot be reduced to a level below those criteria with the applied mitigation.

Cumulative impacts to historic resources could potentially be significant if development of facilities and projects result in adverse impacts to the same historic resource (or district), that cannot be mitigated to a level below significance.

Cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts could be potentially significant due to additive contributions of greenhouse gases from different related projects that cannot be substantively reduced with the applied mitigation.

Cumulative impacts to traffic could be potentially significant due to additive contributions of traffic from different related projects on the same roadway system that cannot be reduced below a level of significance, as determined by the applicable transportation planning agency, with the applied mitigation.

4.18.5 References

Sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4 of the Program EIR addresses the potential cumulative impacts to air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emission, and transportation.

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 5 ALTERNATIVES

Ten alternatives, including the proposed Project, were considered and evaluated in regards to how well each could feasibly meet the basic objectives of the Project and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Five these alternatives were eliminated from detailed consideration either because they would not avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, as discussed in Section 2.4.4 of the Program EIR. Four of the alternatives (in addition to the proposed Project) were carried forward for further analysis to determine whether they could avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project while meeting most of the project goals. These four alternatives are comparatively evaluated along with the proposed Project for all environmental resources in Section 4 of the Program EIR. Chapter 4 of the Program EIR compares the proposed Project and these four alternatives and identifies the environmentally superior alternative. The four alternatives to the Proposed Project that were carried through the analysis of impacts in Section 4 of the Program EIR are:

- No Project: Status quo
- Alternative 1: Non-exclusive system
- Alternative 2: Exclusive system with multiple Franchise Haulers per wasteshed
- Alternative 3: City collection of all Solid Resources

One of the primary elements of the Proposed Project is the collection of source-separated Commingled Recyclables and Organics from Commercial Establishments within the City. This would result in an increase in the number of material streams that would be collected to three (Solid Waste, Commingled Recyclables, and Organics) compared to current conditions under which Solid Waste is the stream primarily collected. As a result, the Proposed Project (and the Alternatives) would result in changes to the VMTs by Permitted and Franchised Hauler trucks throughout the City. The number of VMTs represents a primary differentiator between the Proposed Project and the other alternatives. VMTs also affect the amount of air emissions and greenhouse gases generated by collection trucks. Table 5-1 provides a summary of projected VMTs for the Proposed Project and the alternatives evaluated in the Program EIR.

**TABLE 5-1
FORECAST 2030 VMT AND VHT**

| Alternatives | 2030 VMT | % Change | % Change (No Project vs. Project Alternatives) | 2030 VHT | % Change | % Change (No Project vs. Project Alternatives) |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| 2012 Existing Conditions | 9,143,221 | | | 853,608 | | |
| 2030 Alternatives | | | | | | |
| No Project | 10,488,034 | 15% | - | 992,597 | 16% | - |
| Proposed Project | 10,287,273 | 13% | -2% | 1,073,843 | 26% | 10% |
| Alt 1. Non-Exclusive | 16,107,380 | 76% | 61% | 1,587,034 | 86% | 70% |
| Alt 2. Exclusive, Multiple Franchised Haulers | 16,056,981 | 76% | 61% | 1,582,618 | 85% | 69% |
| Alt 3. City Collection | 10,287,273 | 13% | -2% | 1,073,843 | 26% | 10% |

5.1 REASONABLE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES

Under CEQA, lead agencies are required to evaluate a “reasonable range” of alternatives but are not required to evaluate every possible alternative. Under CEQA, “an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project” (CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(a)). The “range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a ‘rule of reason’ that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice” (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(f)). The Draft EIR contained four alternatives to the Proposed Project (five including the Proposed Project), discussed in Section 2.4 and Section 4 of the Program EIR.

The four alternatives to the Proposed Project provide variations in the number of Franchise Hauler allowed to provide Solid Resources collection and handling within the Franchise Zones (including a non-exclusive Franchise system whereby an unlimited number of Franchise haulers would be able to provide collection and handling services), as well as provision of the services by the City rather than commercial waste haulers.

The four alternatives plus the Proposed Project constitute a reasonable range of alternatives, which permits the decision makers to make a reasoned choice regarding proposed Project approval (or approval of one of its alternatives), approval with modifications, or disapproval.

Furthermore, CEQA does not require an EIR to consider multiple variations on the alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR. “What is required is the production of information sufficient to permit a reasonable choice of alternatives so far as environmental aspects are concerned. (Village Laguna of Laguna Beach, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors of Orange County (1982) 134 Cal.App.3d 1022).

5.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND WITHDRAWN

Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126(f)(2)). Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in an EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(c)). The following alternatives were determined to be infeasible and were eliminated from further consideration in the Program EIR (additional details regarding reasons for rejection are included in Section 2.4.4 of the Program EIR):

- 15 to 20 franchise zones
- 25 franchise zones
- 8 to 10 franchise zones
- Material recovery facility (MRF) processing instead of source separation
- Waste stream alternatives based on multi-streams, single-streams, and mixed-waste streams

5.3 ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON AND RANKING

Section 4 of the Program EIR contains a detailed comparative analysis of the alternatives that were found to achieve the project objectives, are considered ostensibly feasible, and could

reduce environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project or could result in similar impacts as the Proposed Project.

A summary of the impact analysis for the Proposed Project and the Alternatives is shown in Table 5-2 below (same as Table 4-1 in Section 4 of the Program EIR), which identifies the resource areas where the Proposed Project or alternative would result in unavoidable significant impact under CEQA. Table 3.3-1 also presents the resource areas that would have potentially significant impacts mitigated to less than significant, and less than significant impacts. Detailed discussions of the resources with unavoidable significant impacts, potentially significant impacts that can be mitigated to a less than significant level, and less than significant impacts, are provided in Section 4.2 of the Program EIR.

As shown on Table 5-2, the Proposed Project and Alternatives 1 through 3 have significant unavoidable impacts in the areas of Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gases, and Transportation.

**TABLE 5-2
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE AREAS^a**

| D PEIR Section | Environmental Resource Area | Proposed Project | No Project | Alternative 1 - Non-Exclusive | Alternative 2 - Exclusive | Alternative 3 - City Collection |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 3.2.1 | Aesthetics | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.2.2 | Agriculture | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.1.1 | Air Quality | S | L | S | S | S |
| 3.2.3 | Biological Resources | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.1.2 | Cultural Resources | S | N | S | S | S |
| 3.2.4 | Geology and Soils | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.2.5 | Hazards and Hazardous Materials | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.2.6 | Hydrology and Water Quality | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.2.7 | Land Use and Planning | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.2.8 | Mineral Resources | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.2.9 | Noise | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.2.10 | Population and Housing | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.2.11 | Public Services | L | N | L | L | L |
| 3.2.12 | Recreation | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.1.4 | Transportation and Traffic | S | N | S | S | S |
| 3.2.13 | Utilities and Service Systems | M | N | M | M | M |
| 3.1.3 | Greenhouse Gases | S | N | S | S | S |

CEQA Impact Classification

S - significant or potentially significant unavoidable impact

M - significant but mitigable to less than significant impact

L - less than significant impact

N - no impact

Table 5-3 ranks the alternatives based on a comparison of their environmental impacts with those of the Proposed Project. The ranking is based on the significance determinations for the resource areas contained in Table 5-3, as discussed in Sections 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.2.4 of the Program EIR.

**TABLE 5-3
COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE AREAS BY ALTERNATIVE**

| D PEIR Section | Environmental Resource Area | Proposed Project | No Project | Alternative 1 - Non-Exclusive | Alternative 2 - Exclusive | Alternative 3 - City Control |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3.2.1 | Aesthetics | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.2 | Agriculture | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.1.1 | Air Quality | 0 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 |
| 3.2.3 | Biological Resources | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.1.2 | Cultural Resources | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.4 | Geology and Soils | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.5 | Hazards and Hazardous Materials | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.6 | Hydrology and Water Quality | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.7 | Land Use and Planning | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.8 | Mineral Resources | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.9 | Noise | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.10 | Population and Housing | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.11 | Public Services | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2.12 | Recreation | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.1.4 | Transportation | 0 | 2 | -1 | -1 | 0 |
| 3.2.13 | Utilities and Service Systems | 0 | -2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.1.3 | Greenhouse Gases | 0 | 1 | -2 | -2 | 0 |
| | TOTAL | 0 | 14 | -4 | -4 | 0 |

Comparison of Impacts to Proposed Project

- 0 Adverse Impacts similar to Proposed Project
- 1 Adverse Impacts slightly greater than Proposed Project (or beneficial impacts less than the Proposed Project).
- 2 Adverse Impacts moderately greater than Proposed Project (or beneficial impacts less than the Proposed Project).
- +1 Adverse Impacts slightly less than Proposed Project
- +2 Adverse Impacts moderately less than Proposed Project

5.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

As shown in Table 5-3 above, the No Project alternative (continuation of the open market permit system) ranked the highest. This is because it would not result in significant impacts associated with expanded or new processing facilities, transfer stations, or truck base yards.

Alternatives 1 (Non-exclusive system) and Alternative 2 (Exclusive system with multiple Franchise haulers per zone) were ranked the lowest because they would allow multiple haulers to provide service in the City or franchise zone, which would result in slightly greater air quality and GHG impacts due to higher levels of VMTs for collection of Solid Resources. Although the

collection activities would not result in significant air quality or GHG impacts, the collection activities and associated difference in air quality and GHG emissions were used as a proxy to help differentiate ranking of the alternatives.

Alternative 3 was ranked the same as the Proposed Project because it would result in the same expanded or new facilities and collection activity VMTs as the Proposed Project.

CEQA requires the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative, other than the No Project Alternative. Therefore, based on the rankings in Table 5-3 above, the Proposed Project and Alternative 3 are ranked the highest, and are deemed to be Environmentally Superior. Therefore, the Los Angeles City Council finds that the Proposed Project and Alternative 3 are the Environmentally Superior Alternatives.

5.5 ALTERNATIVES SUGGESTED IN COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Several comment letters were received from stakeholders requesting the City analyze additional Project alternatives. The recommendations are similar to one another in some cases, but are generally categorized as follows:

- Evaluate an alternative that requires mixed waste processing to meet diversion goals.
- Evaluate a hybrid system based on diversion goals.
- Evaluate an alternative that simply establishes diversion goals and allows haulers to use their discretion in meeting the diversion goals.
- Evaluate a Franchise system with 18 zones.

Detailed responses to these recommendations are provided in Chapter 2, Response to Comments, of the Final Program EIR.

5.6 FINDINGS FOR ALTERNATIVES

This section makes findings for each of the alternatives evaluated in the Program EIR. The Los Angeles City Council finds that the Proposed Project is preferred because it meets all the Project Goals and is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, whereas the other alternatives would not meet the goals as well as the Proposed Project and/or would not avoid or reduce any of the significant unavoidable impacts of the Proposed Project.

5.6.1 No Project Alternative

Under the current open market system, any Permitted Hauler that meets permitting requirements can collect and dispose of Solid Resources generated by Commercial Establishments within the City. As a result, numerous overlapping collection truck routes collect Solid Resources from the same geographical areas.

The No Project Alternative (Status Quo) maintains the “status quo” of Solid Resources collection from Commercial Establishments through an open market system, and the current operating conditions described in Section 2.1 of the Program EIR would remain in effect.

5.6.1.1 Findings

The Los Angeles City Council hereby finds that the No Project Alternative would not achieve the basic Project Goals of the Proposed Project.

5.6.1.2 Rationale

Achieving the City's Zero Waste goals is dependent on the successful implementation of source-separation of Commingled Recyclables and Organics, their collection and transport to MRFs and Organics processing facilities, and the concurrent development of MRFs and Organics processing capacity to match collection of those materials. Because the No Project Alternative would keep the open market system, there is no ability with this alternative to direct or allocate the Solid Waste and source-separated material streams in a manner that facilitates diversion from landfill disposal. As a consequence, the No Project Alternative is not expected to be able to meet the City's Zero Waste Goals. Similarly, the No Project Alternative is not expected to be able to meet or exceed State requirements for Solid Resource diversion and mandatory recycling.

The No Project Alternative would not require health and safety standards at Permitted Hauler facilities or MRFs or Organics processing facilities and thus, would not meet the goal to improve the health and safety of Solid Resources workers.

As described above, numerous overlapping collection truck routes collect Solid Resources from the same geographical areas under the open market system, and the No Project Alternative would continue this system of overlapping collection routes, which would not meet the objective to improve the efficiency of the City's Solid Resources system.

The open market system does not have provisions that require clean fuel collection vehicles, and as a consequence, continuation of the open market system under the No Project Alternative would not allow the City to achieve its goals of improving air quality by using clean fuel vehicles.

The open market system does not have provisions that require customer service standards, and as a consequence, continuation of the open market system under the No Project Alternative would not allow the City to achieve its goals of providing a high level of customer service.

The open market system does not have provisions that require rates to be consistent or fair and equitable, nor does it have provisions to ensure the provision of reliable service. As a consequence, continuation of the open market system under the No Project Alternative would not allow the City to achieve its goal of establishing fair and equitable rates.

5.6.2 Alternative 1: Non-exclusive system

Alternative 1 would replace the existing open market system for the collection of Solid Resources from Commercial Establishments within the City with a non-exclusive franchise system of collection. The non-exclusive franchise system would be comprised of the following key features and operating conditions:

- Citywide franchise agreement (no franchise zones aside from the City boundaries)
- Unlimited number of Franchised Haulers, provided they meet the franchise agreement terms and conditions

- Private Franchised Hauler set rates (no uniform rates)
- Compliance with AB 341
- Collection of three streams: Blue Bin Commingled Recyclables, Green Bin Organics, and Black Bin Solid Waste
- Recycling services would include a Blue Bin system for the collection of Commingled Recyclables, and a Green Bin system for the collection of Organics, which would be phased in over time
- The City would mandate that every business is provided a recycling service
- The City would mandate maximum annual disposal levels and specific diversion requirements by Franchised Hauler to promote Solid Resource diversion from landfills
- The City would mandate that all Solid Resource collection vehicles operated by the Franchised Haulers be late model, low emission, clean fuel vehicles
- The City would require employees working under the franchise agreement to be paid, at a minimum, a living wage
- The Franchised Haulers would assist the City in complying with existing and new regulations
- New or expanded MRFs, Organics processing facilities, and truck base yards would be developed
- The location and processing capacity of the new or expanded MRFs and the locations of potential/future truck base yards are not known at this time.

5.6.2.1 Findings

The Los Angeles City Council hereby finds that the Alternative 1 would not result in substantially reduced environmental impacts compared to the Proposed Project, and would not eliminate any significant impact of the Proposed Project. Alternative 1 would meet most, but not all, of the project goals and objectives, and would have the same potentially significant impacts as the Proposed Project.

Alternative 1 is not considered a feasible alternative means of avoiding or reducing significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project, since this alternative would require the same expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards as the Proposed Project, and would also result in increased VMTs compared to the Proposed Project. Because of this, the Proposed Project is preferred over Alternative 1.

5.6.2.2 Rationale

Alternative 1 is expected to achieve most of the basic goals and objectives of the Proposed Project, as outlined in Section 2.3.

Achieving the City's goal of Zero Waste is dependent on the successful implementation of source-separation of Commingled Recyclables and Organics, their collection and transport to MRFs and Organics processing facilities and the concurrent development of material processing and organics processing capacity to match collection of those materials. Because Alternative 1

would replace the open market system with a non-exclusive franchise system that is implemented by way of a franchise agreement with Franchised Hauler, this alternative has the ability to allocate the Solid Waste and source-separated material streams in a manner that facilitates diversion from landfill disposal. As a consequence, Alternative 1 is expected to be able to meet the City's Zero Waste Goals. Similarly, Alternative 1 is expected to be able to meet or exceed state requirements for Solid Resources diversion and mandatory recycling (AB 341).

Alternative 1 would require health and safety standards within the Franchised Hauler's operation and any facilities used, and thus, would meet the goal to improve the health and safety of Solid Resources workers.

As described in Section 2.1, numerous overlapping collection truck routes collect Solid Resources from the same geographical areas under the open market system, and Alternative 1 would replace this system with a non-exclusive franchise system that also allows overlapping collection routes throughout the City. As a consequence, this Alternative would not introduce routing efficiencies. It would result in greater VMTs than the Proposed Project, and would not meet the objective to improve the efficiency of the City's Solid Resources system.

Alternative 1 would require that Franchised Hauler fleets be comprised of late model, low emission, clean fuel collection vehicles. As a consequence, Alternative 1 would allow the City to achieve its goals of improving air quality by using late model, low emission, clean fuel vehicles.

Alternative 1 would require Franchised Haulers to meet a minimum level of customer service standards. As a consequence, Alternative 1 would allow the City to achieve its goals of providing a high level of customer service.

Under Alternative 1, Franchised Haulers would establish their own rates to allow the multiple Franchised Haulers to compete for collection services. As a consequence, Alternative 1 would not allow the City to achieve its goal of establishing fair and equitable rates. Furthermore, since multiple Franchised Haulers would compete to provide collection services in each zone, the City would not require Franchised Haulers to establish a system for back-up collection in the event of an emergency or service disruption.

5.6.3 Alternative 2: Exclusive system with multiple Franchise Haulers per wasteshed

Alternative 2 would replace the existing open market system for the collection of Solid Resources from Commercial Establishments within the City with an exclusive franchise system that limits the number of waste Franchised Haulers per collection zone. Exclusive Franchise System with multiple Franchised Haulers would be comprised of the following key features and operating conditions:

- Eleven franchise zones (same as Proposed Project)
- Up to 5 Franchised Haulers per zone (2 large and 3 small each)
- Private Franchised Haulers set rates (no uniform rates)
- Compliance with AB 341 and Zero Waste Goals
- Collection of up to three streams: Blue Bin Commingled Recyclables, Green Bin Organics, and Black Bin Solid Waste

- Recycling services would include a Blue Bin system for the collection of Commingled Recyclables, and a Green Bin system for the collection of Organics, which would be phased in over time
- The City would mandate that every business is provided a recycling service
- The City would mandate maximum annual disposal levels and specific diversion requirements for each franchise zone to promote Solid Resources diversion from landfills
- The City would mandate that all Solid Resources collection vehicles operated by the Franchised Haulers be late model, low emission, clean fuel vehicles
- The City would require employees working under the franchise agreements to be paid, at a minimum, a living wage
- The Franchised Haulers would assist the City in complying with existing and new regulations
- New or expanded MRFs and Organics processing facilities, and truck base yards are expected to be completed
- The location and processing capacity of the new or expanded recycling facilities and the locations of truck base yards are not known at this time

5.6.3.1 Findings

The Los Angeles City Council hereby finds that the Alternative 2 would not result in substantially reduced environmental impacts compared to the Proposed Project, and would not eliminate any significant impact of the Proposed Project. Alternative 2 would meet the project goals and objectives, and would have the same potentially significant impacts as the Proposed Project.

Alternative 2 is not considered a feasible alternative means of avoiding or reducing significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project, since this alternative would require the same expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards as the Proposed Project, and would result in increased VMTs compared to the Proposed Project. Because of this, the Proposed Project is preferred over Alternative 2.

5.6.3.2 Rationale

Alternative 2 is expected to achieve most of the basic Program Goals and Objectives outlined in Section 2.3.

Achieving the City's goal of Zero Waste is dependent on the successful implementation of source-separation of Commingled Recyclables and Organics, their collection and transport to MRFs and Organics processing facilities, and the concurrent development of material processing and organics processing capacity to match collection of those materials. Alternative 2 would replace the open market system with an exclusive franchise system with up to 5 Franchised Haulers per zone. Alternative 2 would be implemented by way of a franchise agreement with Franchised Haulers, and would have the ability to allocate the Solid Waste and source-separated recyclable material streams in a manner that facilitates diversion from landfill disposal. As a consequence, Alternative 2 is expected to be able to meet the City's goal of

Zero Waste. Similarly, Alternative 2 is expected to be able to meet or exceed State requirements for Solid Resources diversion and mandatory recycling, set forth in AB 341.

Alternative 2 would require health and safety standards at Franchised Hauler facilities or MRFs and Organics processing facilities, and thus, would meet the goal to improve the health and safety of Solid Resources workers.

As described above, numerous overlapping collection truck routes collect Solid Resources from the same geographical areas under the open market system. Alternative 2 would replace this system of overlapping collection routes, with an exclusive franchise system that also allows up to 5 Franchised Haulers to service each zone. Thus, some overlapping collection routes would still occur within each zone under Alternative 2. As a consequence, this Alternative would not introduce the degree of routing efficiencies, as it would result in greater VMT and VHT than the Proposed Project. Alternative 2 would not meet the objective to improve the efficiency of the City's Solid Resources system as well as the Proposed Project.

Alternative 2 would require that Franchised Hauler fleets be comprised of late model, low emission, clean fuel collection vehicles. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would allow the City to achieve its goals of improving air quality by using clean fuel vehicles.

Alternative 2 would require Franchised Haulers to meet a minimum level of customer service standards. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would allow the City to achieve its goals of providing a high level of customer service.

Under Alternative 2, Franchised Haulers would establish their own rates to allow Franchised Haulers to compete for collection. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would not allow the City to achieve its goal of establishing fair and equitable rates. Furthermore, since multiple Franchised Haulers would compete to provide collection services in each zone, the City would not require Franchised Haulers to establish a system for back-up collection in the event of an emergency or service disruption.

5.6.4 Alternative 3: City collection of all Solid Resources

Under Alternative 3, the City's Bureau of Sanitation would collect and manage Solid Resources from all Commercial Establishments currently serviced by private Permitted Haulers. Alternative 3 would replace the existing open market operating conditions described in Section 2.1 with essentially the same operating conditions as the Proposed Project, described in Section 2.4, except the following: 1) collection would be based on existing wastesheds, and 2) the City would perform the collection activities. City collection of all materials would be comprised of the following key features:

- Collection zones based on existing wastesheds
- The City would establish a fair and equitable rate structure for each collection zone. The rate structure may be similar for multiple or all franchise collection zones. This rate structure would detail the rate schedule for solid waste and recycling collection services businesses will pay.
- The City would establish a formula and caps on how rates charged to Solid Resources collection services businesses can be increased annually.

- Under the Proposed Project, three collection streams are anticipated—Blue Bin Commingled Recyclables, Green Bin Organics, and Black Bin Solid Waste.
- Recycling services would include a blue bin system for the collection of Commingled Recyclables, and a Green Bin system for the collection of Organics, which would be phased in over time.
- The City would mandate that every business is provided a recycling service.
- The City would implement maximum annual disposal levels and specific diversion requirements to promote Solid Resources diversion from landfills.
- The City's Solid Resources collection vehicles would be late model low emission clean fuel vehicles.
- The City would ensure that employees would be paid, at a minimum, a living wage.
- The City would comply with existing and new regulations.
- New or expanded recycling facilities would be needed as recycling increases under Alternative 3.
- New or expanded facilities that support collection activities, such as truck base yards, could be required.
- The location and processing capacity of the new or expanded recycling facilities and the locations of truck base yards are not known at this time.

Alternative 3 would involve:

- City's existing collection fleet for servicing single-family residences are designed to collect Commingled Recyclables, Organics, and Solid Waste from the side of the trucks, from standardized trash receptacles (Blue, Green, and Black bins). Under this alternative, the City would purchase a new fleet collection of trucks designed for front-end collection and would provide/replace Solid Resource Containers at all Commercial Establishments, as the existing ones are owned by private Permitted Haulers.
- City has multiple truck staging yards strategically located throughout the City which would be used to meet demand requirements.

5.6.4.1 Findings

The Los Angeles City Council hereby finds that the Alternative 3 would not result in substantially reduced environmental impacts compared to the Proposed Project, and would not eliminate any significant impact of the Proposed Project. Alternative 3 would meet the project goals and objectives, and would have the same potentially significant impacts as the Proposed Project.

Alternative 3 is not considered a feasible alternative means of avoiding or reducing significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project, since this alternative would require the same expanded or new facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards as the Proposed Project, and would result in the same VMTs compared to the Proposed Project.

Alternative 3 would require considerable capital expenditures to acquire a new fleet of collection vehicles and collection infrastructure to provide solid resources collection and handling services

to multifamily and commercial establishment in the City. For these reasons, the Proposed Project is preferred over Alternative 3.

5.6.4.2 Rationale

Alternative 3 has essentially the same environmental profile as the Proposed Project except that instead of using private commercial waste haulers, City collection vehicles and equipment would have to be acquired and would be utilized to collect Solid Resources from multi-family and commercial establishments from throughout each of the City's wastesheds.

The City does not currently have a fleet of collection vehicles that could collect Solid Resources from multi-family and commercial establishments within the City, and would have to acquire such a fleet and other physical and logistical infrastructure to implement Alternative 3.