

ADDENDUM 2:

2014 CERTIFIED PROGRAM EIR for the CITY-WIDE EXCLUSIVE FRANCHISE SYSTEM for MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE COLLECTION and HANDLING

Prepared for the Proposed Facility Certification Program, a subsequent activity in the City-wide Exclusive Franchise System (recycLA) Program



SCH No. 2013021052

Prepared By:

Solid Resources Commercial Franchise Division
Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation
1149 South Broadway, Suite 500, MS 942
Los Angeles, California 90015



with assistance from:

Envicraft LLC

October 2018

This page left intentionally blank

Table of Contents

Page

BACKGROUND1

PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM 21

 The Previously Approved Program Franchise Elements2

 Proposed Facility Certification Program Elements with the
 Potential for Physical Changes4

 CEQA Guidelines 15168(c) and 15162 Determination5

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:9

 AESTHETICS 11

 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES 15

 AIR QUALITY 20

 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 25

 CULTURAL RESOURCES 31

 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 35

 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS 42

 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS 43

 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY 50

 LAND USE AND PLANNING: 59

 MINERAL RESOURCES 62

 NOISE 64

 POPULATION AND HOUSING 69

 PUBLIC SERVICES 72

 RECREATION 77

 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC 79

 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS 83

 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE 91

**INCORPORATION OF FEASIBLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND
ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPED IN THE PROGRAM EIR 93**

LIST OF PREPARERS 93

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	i	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	---	--

This page left intentionally blank

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	ii	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

BACKGROUND

On November 14, 2012, Los Angeles City Council directed the City of Los Angeles' (City) Bureau of Sanitation (LASAN) to develop an implementation plan for the Exclusive Commercial and Multifamily Solid Waste Franchise system. LASAN prepared a Final Report (Exclusive Commercial and Multifamily Solid Waste Franchise Hauling System Implementation Plan) in April 2013 (LASAN, 2013) which described the existing open-market system and its limitations, identified goals for the Exclusive Franchise system, identified recommended Program strategies, and provided an implementation timeline.

The City prepared a Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR) for the City-Wide Exclusive Franchise System for Municipal Solid Waste Collection and Handling: Industrial, Institutional, Commercial, and Large Multi-Family Residential Units (SCH No. 2013021052), and on April 15, 2014, the City Council certified the Program EIR and approved the Adoption of City Ordinance (No. 182986), which established the Exclusive Franchise System. The adopted Program replaced the existing open market system for commercial Solid Resources with the Exclusive Franchise System, under which the City established 11 franchise collection zones, and awarded a single Franchise Waste Hauler (through a competitive bidding process) the exclusive rights to operate in each franchise collection zone. The Exclusive Franchise System has since been renamed "recycLA," and the term "Franchise Waste Hauler" and been replaced with "recycLA Service Provider" or RSP. Under recycLA, an exclusive RSP would be responsible for collecting and processing solid resources collected from its respective collection zone.

Ordinance No. 182986 codified the requirement for Franchise Waste Haulers (aka RSP) to use City Certified Facilities. Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) states: A Franchisee shall deliver all recyclables and organics collected from commercial establishments and multifamily dwellings exclusively to facilities certified by the City pursuant to Section 66.33.9. Section 66.33.9 specifies the right of the City to grant a facility certification to those accepting materials under the recycLA Program, under criteria established by the City, and after City inspection. It also gives authority to the City to suspend or revoke certification if the facility fails to comply with the requirements of the Certification.

As authorized by Ordinance No. 182986, the City is implementing a Facility Certification Program (FCP) that is intended to ensure that Solid Resources are managed in compliance with the requirements of recycLA and that facilities meet Program Goals (LASAN, 2013), including Goal 3: Improve Health and Safety for Solid Waste Workers, and Goal 10: Ensure reliable system infrastructure to provide uninterrupted service to Customers.

PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM 2

Under recycLA, facilities would require certification (through the FCP) before the facilities could handle and process Solid Resources generated in the City of Los Angeles. Most of the FCP elements would not result in physical changes to the environment, such as record keeping, regulatory permit and compliance requirements and health and safety compliance requirements; however, the FCP would require that certain new and existing facilities be enclosed, which would result in physical changes to the environment.

The purpose of this Addendum (Addendum 2) is to describe and evaluate the environmental effects of the FCP activities that would require enclosure of new and existing facilities. A

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	1	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	---	---

previous addendum to the Program EIR, adopted December 9, 2016 (Addendum), analyzed subsequent activities to the Program EIR related to contract awards. Addendum 2 explains why no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required to be prepared. Because no new significant environmental effects would occur and no new mitigation would be required for these Program changes, the FCP requirements to enclose some existing facilities are within the scope of the project covered by the certified Program EIR and no subsequent or supplement EIR is required.

Enclosure of new or expanded preprocessing, processing and/or transfer facilities under the FCP, consistent with the Program EIR, are not being approved by the virtue of their certification under the FCP. Rather, the individual facility enclosure projects would be subject to project approvals by the appropriate lead agencies after their site-specific project-level evaluation under CEQA, and this evaluation is limited to the program-level analysis for requiring certain enclosures based on the proposed facility certification program. As allowed under CEQA, the certified Program EIR may be used in the future as a tiering document for the environmental review of such future Program activities, which would include subsequent activities in the scope of the Program EIR.

The Previously Approved Program Franchise Elements

Under the Franchise Program discussed in the certified Program EIR and the Addendum dated November 22, 2016, Franchise Haulers (now called RSPs, as noted above) would operate under the following conditions, which are summarized from the certified Program EIR and the previous Addendum, and modified to reflect current recycLA terminology:

- The City would establish 11 geographical franchise collection zones. These zones delineate the boundaries in which the RSP(s) would be allowed to operate. The City Council designated the zone boundaries in its action of April 26, 2013.
- The City would award a RSP the exclusive rights to operate in each of the 11 franchise collection zones.
- A single RSP 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 Commercial Establishments will pay.
- The City would establish a formula and caps on how rates for Solid Resources and recycling collection services that are charged to Commercial Establishments can be increased annually.
- Under the Program, three major collection streams are anticipated: Commingled Recyclables (Blue Bin), Organics (Green Bin), and Solid Waste (Black Bin). A small number of customers (about 20 out of more than 70,000) may require Horse Manure (Brown Bin) servicers. Recycling services would include a Blue Bin system for the collection of Commingled Recyclables. These collection streams are the same as the City uses for its residential side collection.
- Existing container cleaning would continue under recycLA, and in some cases be increased to annual cleaning. Cleaning activities would be handled at material

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	2	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	---	--

processing facilities, at the point of collection using a fully contained cleaning truck, or at truck base yards.

- Existing Organics recycling will be preserved. This includes restaurants participating in the City'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. RSPs 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 be provided a recycling service.
- The City would mandate maximum annual disposal levels and specific diversion requirements for each franchise zone to promote Solid Resource diversion from landfills.
- The City would mandate that all Solid Resources collection vehicles operated by the RSP 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 Living Wage Ordinance.
- The RSP would assist the City in complying with existing and new regulations.
- The RSP would assist the City in citywide public education.
- The RSP would provide consistent reporting on all downstream recycling activities.
- The Program would provide a partnership between the City and the RSP to increase diversion and identify challenges.
- New or expanded recycling facilities 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, could be required.
- The location and processing capacity of the new or expanded recycling 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 the City (e.g., biosolids, fats, oils, and grease).

recyclLA – Facility Certification Program	3	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
---	---	---

- The City would require full enclosure of future facilities to the maximum extent practicable to avoid nuisance issues. (Mitigation Measure LU-2.)

RecycLA includes the collection of source-separated municipal solid waste (MSW, Black Bin material), organics (Green Bin material), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin material) generated by multi-family and commercial establishments.

Proposed Facility Certification Program Elements with the Potential for Physical Changes

The FCP is a supporting element of recycLA that is intended to ensure that facilities that accept Solid Resources from the City comply with applicable Program goals set forth in the 2013 Implementation Plan, while minimizing impacts to the environment. The full text of the FCP is provided in the Appendix A of Addendum 2. The collection, preprocessing, processing, and transfer of Solid Resources generated in the City of Los Angeles by new and existing facilities that would be certified under the FCP were evaluated in the previously certified Program EIR.

Much of the FCP involves activities that would not result in physical changes to the environment, such as record keeping, regulatory permit and compliance requirements, and health and safety compliance requirements; however, the FCP would require that certain new and existing facilities be enclosed. In particular, the FCP would require the following:

- Enclosure of new and existing Organic Materials facilities that transfer, preprocess and/or process recycLA Green Bin material (green waste, food waste, or mixed organics) would be required, with the exception of Composting Facilities. Organic materials collected in Green Bins may be taken to pre-processing facilities for activities such as contamination removal, sizing, and sorting.
- Enclosure of new and existing Solid Waste (Black Bin) preprocessing, processing, and transfer facilities would be required. Solid Wastes collected in Black Bins are hauled either directly or indirectly via transfer stations to landfill facilities, waste-to-energy facilities, or potentially to Black Bin Material Recovery Facilities for processing to sort and recover recyclables. The enclosure requirements under the FCP would apply to new and existing facilities or isolated operations within those facilities (e.g. transfer stations and Material Recovery Facilities) that preprocess, process, or transfer Solid Wastes (Black Bin) generated within the City, but would not apply to composting facilities (as stated above), landfills and recycling centers, which would be exempt from the recycLA enclosure requirements.
- Enclosure of new and existing Commingled Recyclable (Blue Bin) facilities would be required. Commingled Recyclables collected in Blue Bins are hauled to Material Recovery Facilities for processing to sort and recover Commingled Recyclables or hauled to transfer stations. The enclosure requirements under the FCP would apply to new and existing facilities that process and/or transfer Commingled Recyclables generated within the City, but would not apply to composting facilities (as stated above), landfills, and recycling centers.
- Fully enclosed building(s) would be required to have misting systems for dust and odor suppression that must be operational during facility operating hours including during the receipt, handling and processing of applicable materials. As necessary, a permitted odor cleansing system, such as a scrubber or air filtration system would be required to be installed prior to emission discharge to the atmosphere, if misting does not provide sufficient odor removal.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	4	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	---	--

The City would implement the facility enclosures described above to improve health and safety for solid waste workers (Goal 3 of the Exclusive Commercial and Multifamily Solid Waste Franchise Hauling System Implementation Plan), ensure reliable system infrastructure to provide uninterrupted service under the recycLA Program (Goal 10 of the Exclusive Commercial and Multifamily Solid Waste Franchise Hauling System Implementation Plan), and minimize potential environmental impacts in the vicinity of such facilities and/or potential conflicts with nearby land uses.

CEQA Guidelines 15168(c) and 15162 Determination

The City has determined the following under CEQA Guidelines 15168 with respect to the FCP and the previously-approved Program EIR and RecycLA:

1. The FCP is within the scope and is therefore a subsequent activity of the Program EIR and project for purposes of CEQA. The proposed Project evaluated in the certified Program EIR was the adoption of a proposed ordinance by the City, for the implementation of a Citywide Exclusive Franchise System for Solid Resources Collection and Handling (certified Program EIR, page 1-1). Ordinance No. 182986 (the implementing ordinance for recycLA) requires that recyclables, organics, and solid wastes collected from commercial establishments and multifamily dwellings under the program be delivered to facilities that have been certified by the City. The ordinance specifies that facility certifications may be granted for as long as 5-year periods, and conditions certification on meeting LASAN and facility inspections. The FCP represents activities that would implement requirements of recycLA as outlined in the program's implementing ordinance; thus, the FCP is within the scope of recycLA.

As stated in the certified Program EIR (page 1-1), one goal of the Program EIR is to mitigate environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures. The certified Program EIR evaluated new facilities and expansion of existing facilities under recycLA, and included mitigation measure LU-2 (page 3-168), which requires the enclosure of facilities to minimize the effects of facility processing on surrounding land uses. The enclosure requirements under the FCP implement mitigation measure LU-2 from the certified Program EIR. In summary, the FCP is a subsequent activity of recycLA and the certified Program EIR for the following reasons:

- The certified program EIR evaluated the impacts associated with the adoption of the City ordinance implementing a Citywide Exclusive Franchise System for Solid Resources Collection and Handling,
 - The adopted ordinance for recycLA includes facility certification requirements that are implemented by the FCP, and
 - The FCP implements mitigation applied in the certified Program EIR (mitigation measure LU-2) that requires the enclosure of facilities to minimize the effects of facility processing on surrounding land uses.
2. The FCP does not have effects that were not examined in the Program EIR and pursuant to CEQA Section 15162 no new effects could occur and no new mitigation measures would be required.

See below for the CEQA Guidelines 15162 determinations.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	5	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	---	---

3. Feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the Program EIR will be incorporated into the FCP.

The certified Program EIR evaluated the impacts of recycLA and its program-wide alternatives. The evaluation of new facilities and expansion of existing facilities was at a conceptual level, and mitigation measures were applied to the facilities, which would be implemented via the project-specific environmental document prepared by the applicable Lead Agencies when plans for such facilities are developed and their locations are identified (certified Program EIR, page 1-4). In addition, the certified Program EIR stated that the jurisdiction responsible for CEQA compliance may choose to tier the environmental analysis from the Program EIR.

The majority of mitigation measures applied in the Program EIR are intended to be applied at the time site site-specific environmental documentation is prepared, assuming that the applicable Lead Agency tiers from the certified Program EIR or applies similar mitigation at the local level. Certification of facilities under the FCP would not be approval of any required facility modification; rather, such approvals and associated site-specific CEQA documentation would still be required by the applicable Lead Agencies. Thus, the FCP would not be an implementing vehicle for many of the mitigation measures identified in the certified Program. However, the FCP would require facility enclosures and installation of odor control systems at facilities, and these are mitigation measures discussed in the certified Program EIR (mitigation measure LU-2, discussed on pages 3-162 and 3-168, requires the enclosure of facilities to minimize the effects of facility processing on surrounding land uses; and mitigation measure AQ-21, discussed on pages 3-22 and 3-24, requires odor control features in facilities). Thus, the FCP requires mitigation measures applied in the Program EIR to address potential land use impacts and odor impacts (the enclosures and odor control systems would still require project-level CEQA compliance by the applicable Lead Agency as part of the facilities' local land use approval processes). In addition, as part of the approval of Addendum 2 and the FCP and as noted below in the section titled "Incorporation of Feasible Mitigation Measures and Alternatives Developed in the Program EIR," the City will incorporate feasible mitigation measures developed in the Program EIR. The Program EIR's mitigation measures are also discussed within each impact area reviewed in the CEQA Section 15164(c)(4) checklist, below.

4. The FCP does not involve site specific operations, and the City has documented below in the CEQA Section 15168(c)(4) checklist that the environmental effects of the FCP were covered in the Program EIR and/or did not result in any new effects or mitigation measures per CEQA Section 15162.

The City has examined the potential environmental effects of the FCP, which is a supporting element of the recycLA program, to determine if any additional environmental document is required. The City has determined the following under CEQA Guidelines 15162:

1. The FCP represents minor technical changes and potential minor expansions of use (enclosure of certain new and existing facilities) that will not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects from those identified in the 2014 certified Program EIR.

See CEQA Section 15168(c)(4) checklist below.

2. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Program is being undertaken that would require major revisions of the previously

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	6	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	---	---

certified Program EIR due to the involvement of new significant effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects identified in the certified Program EIR.

As discussed above, the FCP is a subsequent activity of recycLA that would implement elements of recycLA, as required in the program's implementing ordinance; thus, the FCP is within the scope of recycLA and does not represent a change from recycLA.

3. No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Program EIR was certified, shows that:
 - (A) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the certified EIR;
 - (B) significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the certified Program EIR;
 - (C) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the Program, but the City declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those identified in the certified Program EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects, but the City declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

See CEQA Section 15168(c)(4) checklist below.

Because the City has determined under CEQA Guidelines 15162 that no new effects will occur and no new mitigation is required for the FCP, the FCP can be approved within the scope of the Program covered by the certified Program EIR and no new environmental document is required per CEQA Guidelines 15168(c).

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	7	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	---	--

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15168(C)(4) WRITTEN CHECKLIST _____

1. Project Title:	Facilities Certification Program (FCP) that supports implementation of recyclLA (formerly the City-Wide Exclusive Franchise System for Municipal Solid Waste Collection and Handling: Industrial, Institutional, Commercial, and Large Multi-Family Residential Units)
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation 1149 South Broadway, Suite 500, MS 942 Los Angeles, California 90015
3. Contact Person and Phone Number:	Lisa Carlson (213) 485-3932
4. Project Location:	City of Los Angeles
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation Solid Resources Commercial Franchise Division 1149 South Broadway, Suite 500, MS 942 Los Angeles, California 90015
6. General Plan Designation:	Not Applicable
7. Zoning:	Not Applicable
8. Description of Project:	The FCP is a supporting element of the recyclLA Program that is intended to ensure that facilities that accept Solid Resources from the City comply with applicable Programs goals set forth in the 2013 Implementation Plan, while minimizing impacts to the environment. The FCP would require that new and existing facilities be enclosed, specifically, the enclosure of new and existing Organic Materials (Green Bin) pre-processing, certain processing and transfer facilities, the enclosure of new and existing Solid Waste (Black Bin) preprocessing, processing, and

recyclLA – Facility Certification Program	8	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
---	---	---

	transfer facilities, and the enclosure of new and existing Commingled Recyclables (Blue Bin) processing and transfer facilities.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:	Existing and new facilities under the recycLA Program could be located within the City or outside City boundaries, and as this Written Checklist evaluates impacts at a conceptual or program level, specific locations are not evaluated. Site specific impacts and impacts to surrounding land uses would be evaluated by the applicable Lead Agency at the time a facility seeks entitlements and/or permits.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):	No other agency approvals or permits are required for the City to certify a new or existing facility under the FCP. Approval of other agencies may be required prior to or following site specific environmental clearance by the lead agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located.

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

1. The Written Checklist below has been modified to conform with CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(C)(4) in order to determine whether the environmental effects of the FCP were covered in the certified Program EIR.

2. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “no impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “no impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “no impact” answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

3. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off site as well as on site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. Since the Written Checklist is used to evaluate a subsequent Program activity to determine whether its environmental effects were covered in the certified Program EIR, the Written Checklist impact headings are relative to the impacts and mitigation measures identified in the certified Program EIR. “Potentially significant impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be a new or substantially more severe significant impact than discussed in the certified Program EIR. If there are one or more “potentially significant impact” entries when the determination is made, a subsequent EIR is required.

4. A “less than significant with mitigation incorporated” applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures in addition to those applied in the certified Program EIR has reduced an effect from a “potentially significant impact” to a “less than significant impact,” relative to the

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	9	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	---	---

impacts identified in the certified Program EIR. The lead agency must describe the new mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (relative to the certified Program EIR).

5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063[c][3][D]). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

(a) Earlier analysis used. Identify and state where earlier analyses are available for review.

(b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

(c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are “less than significant with mitigation incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting information sources. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

(a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and

(b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

10. The evaluations with this Written Checklist assume compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, rules, and codes. In addition, the evaluation assumes that all conditions in applicable agency permits are complied with, including but not limited to local permits, air quality district permits, water quality permits and certifications, and other agency permits, as applicable.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	10	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?				X
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following regarding new facilities and expansion of existing facilities in its discussion of impacts on Aesthetic Resources:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities).
- Future processing facilities and truck base yards are expected to be consistent with the uses typically found in industrial areas.
- Organics processing facilities could be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.
- Industrial areas and agricultural areas are generally established in the applicable General Plan, and future new or expanded facilities would be subject to applicable ordinances and regulations that govern building design, establish development standards (including lighting), and address potential impacts to designated visual resources.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized in the Aesthetic Resources impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The certified Program EIR, in evaluating impacts to scenic vistas under Impact AES-1, determined the following:

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	11	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

- Outside of the City, there is the possibility that lands zoned for industrial or agricultural uses could contain or be located in proximity to a scenic vista.
- The location of future new or expanded facilities is 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 result in adverse impacts to a designated scenic vista from construction-related disturbances and site development.
- If substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista were to occur, implementation of mitigation measures VR-1 through VR-7 would mitigate adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for new facilities and expansion of existing facilities to affect scenic vistas within and outside of the City, and applied mitigation measures (VR-1 through VR-7) to facilities that could adversely affect a scenic vista. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of the facilities, and would result in enclosure of preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials, municipal solid wastes, and commingled recyclables, which would shield those activities from view. Therefore, the FCP would not result in significant impacts on a scenic vista. No new significant impacts to scenic vistas would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects on scenic vistas from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

The certified Program EIR, in evaluating impacts to scenic highways under Impact AES-2, determined the following:

- Industrial areas and agricultural areas are established in the applicable General Plan, and are not generally considered scenic resources, nor do these areas generally contain valued trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within the view shed of a state or locally-designated scenic highway.
- Since the location of future new or expanded facilities is unknown at this time; there is the possibility that lands zoned for industrial or agricultural uses could be located within the view shed of a designated scenic highway, and because of this, 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 view shed of a state scenic highway.
- If substantial adverse effects on a scenic resource were to occur, implementation of mitigation measures VR-1 through VR-7 would mitigate adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in impacts to scenic highways within and outside of the City, and applied mitigation

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	12	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

measures (VR-1 through VR-7) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of the facilities, and would result in enclosure of preprocessing, processing, and/or transfer activities for organic materials, municipal solid wastes, and commingled recyclables, which would shield those activities from view. Therefore, the FCP would not result in significant impacts on scenic highways. No new significant impacts to scenic highways would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects on views from scenic highways from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The certified Program EIR, in evaluating impacts to visual character under Impact AES-3, determined the following:

- Industrial areas and agricultural areas are established in the applicable General Plan, which generally includes provisions and regulations addressing potential degradation to visual resources.
- Since the location of future new or expanded facilities is unknown at this time, 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.
- If substantial adverse effects on the existing visual character or quality of a specific site were to occur, implementation of mitigation measures VR-1 through VR-7 would mitigate adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact visual character within and outside of the City, and applied mitigation measures (VR-1 through VR-7) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of the facilities, and would result in enclosure of preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials, municipal solid wastes, and commingled recyclables, which would shield those activities from view. Therefore, the FCP would not substantially degrade existing visual character in the vicinity of facilities. No new significant impacts to visual character would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects on visual character from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	13	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

The certified Program EIR, in evaluating light and glare impacts on daytime or nighttime views related to the new or expanded facilities under Impact AES-4, determined the following:

- Although the new or expanded facilities and truck base yards would require site lighting, such lighting would be expected to be consistent with that found in industrial areas.
- Although Organics processing facility would require site lighting, such lighting is expected to be directed on areas within the facilities and away from adjacent areas.
- Since the location of future new or expanded facilities is 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.
- If substantial adverse effects from new site-specific sources of light or glare were to occur, implementation of mitigation measures VR-2, VR-6 and VR-7 would mitigate the adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in light and glare impacts within and outside of the City, and applied mitigation measures (VR-2, VR-6 and VR-7) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of the facilities, and would result in the enclosure of preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials, municipal solid wastes, and commingled recyclables, which would shield work lights directed at the processing activities from external view. Although the required enclosures may require exterior safety lighting, such lighting would be of lower intensity than the work lights that the enclosures would shield. Therefore, the FCP would not result in significant light and glare impacts. No new significant impacts from light and glare would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant light and glare effects from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	14	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	<p>AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X	
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?			X	
c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in PRC Section 4526)?			X	
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X	
recycLA – Facility Certification Program		15		Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018	

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X	

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s impacts on Agricultural Resources:

- Within the City, there is limited agricultural land in the Sepulveda Basin and at Pierce College, and the dedicated uses (under the control of an educational institution) or regulatory framework (flood control purposes within the Sepulveda Dam Basin) of these agricultural uses likely preclude siting of an Organics facility.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Agricultural Resources impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance from new and expanded processing facilities and truck base yards under Impact AG-1 and determined the following:

- If future facility sites include locations that support FMMP-classified land, then there is a potential for a significant impact.
- As future facilities are proposed, they would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Implementation of the mitigation measures AG-1 through AG-4 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level should a future facility be sited on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact farmland and applied mitigation measures (AG-1 through AG-4) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause facilities to be relocated to farmland. Enclosing facilities under the FCP is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, as the enclosures would merely need to house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer work areas. New facilities and existing facilities would likely be located within an area designated for facility activities, with a setback area or perimeter

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	16	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

buffer zone between the actual facility work area and surrounding agricultural lands, if any. As an example, the agricultural areas in the Sepulveda Basin and Pierce College that are discussed in the certified Program are bounded by paved and unpaved buffer zones, and where there are non-agricultural developments adjacent to or within the agricultural areas, buffer zones are used to clearly separate the uses. Buffer zones between agricultural uses and adjacent non-agricultural uses are commonly used in agricultural areas outside the City. Facility enclosures would likely be located around the designated facility area and would not likely require the relocation of the setback areas or perimeter buffer zones.

Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of affected farmland, if any. As a consequence, the FCP would not result in significant impacts to Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. No new significant impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts on existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract from siting of new and expanded processing facilities and truck base yards under Impact AG-2 and determined the following:

- 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.
- As future facilities are proposed, they would be subject to additional review pursuant to CEQA, at which time additional environmental review to identify conflicts with existing zoning or Williamson Act contracts would occur. Implementation of the mitigation measures AG-1 through AG-4 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact lands zoned for agriculture or under Williamson Act contract, and applied mitigation measures (AG-1 through AG-4) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause facilities to be relocated to lands zoned for agriculture or to lands under Williamson Act contract. Enclosing facilities under the FCP is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, as the enclosures would merely need to house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones; therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of land zoned for agriculture (or under Williamson Act contract), if any. As a consequence, the FCP would not result in significant impacts on land zoned for agriculture or under Williamson Act contract. No new significant impacts related to the potential conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	17	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of potential conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in PRC Section 4526)?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts on existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production from siting of new and expanded processing facilities and truck base yards under Impact AG-3 and determined the following:

- No forest land or lands used for timber production are located within the City.
- If future facilities are sited outside of the City on lands with existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, or result in the loss of forest land or convert forest land to non-forest use, there is a potential for a significant impact to occur.
- As future facilities are proposed, they would be subject to additional review pursuant to CEQA, at which time additional environmental review to identify conflicts to existing forest land or timberland, loss of forest land, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use would occur. Implementation of the mitigation measures AG-1 through AG-4 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact lands zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, and applied mitigation measures (AG-1 through AG-4) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause facilities to be relocated to lands zoned for forest land or timberland. Enclosing facilities under the FCP is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, as the enclosures would merely need to house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones; therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of affected land zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, if any. As a consequence, the FCP would not result in significant impacts on land zoned for forest land or timberland. No new significant impacts related to potential impacts on existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of potential impacts on existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The evaluation herein is the same as under Checklist Item II.c. above.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	18	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

e. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts due to the conversion of farmlands to non-farmland uses, and the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses under Impact AG-5 and determined the following:

- If future sites include locations that support Farmland or forestland, then there is a potential for a significant impact to occur.
- As future facilities are proposed, they would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA, at which time additional environmental review to identify changes to or conversion of existing farm and forest land would occur. Implementation of the mitigation measures AG-1 through AG-4 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities to impact Farmland and lands that support forest land within and outside of the City, and applied mitigation measures (AG-1 through AG-4) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause facilities to be relocated to an area where farmland or forest land could be converted to other uses. Enclosing facilities under the FCP is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, as the enclosures would merely need to house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones; therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of affected farmland or forest land, if any. As a consequence, the FCP would not result in significant impacts related to the conversion for farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses. No new significant impacts related to the conversion of farmlands to non-farmland uses or the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of potential impacts from the conversion of farmlands to non-farmland uses or the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

III.	AIR QUALITY. When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a non-attainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s impacts to Air Quality:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities).
- Future processing facilities and truck base yards are expected to be consistent with the uses typically found in industrial areas.
- Organics processing facilities could be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Air Quality impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the new and expanded facilities to result in conflicts with the air quality management plan, and determined the following:

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	20	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

- Emission from construction of new or expanded transfer stations, MRFs, Organics processing facilities, and new truck base yards are assumed to exceed significance thresholds but Mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-13 would minimize construction emissions.
- 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 this Draft Program EIR; therefore, the new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, or truck base yards could result in conflicts with air quality management plans.
- Emissions from these facilities operation will be further addressed in the project specific environmental document prepared by the lead agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located when the specific new or expanded facilities operation are proposed and better defined. Mitigation measures AQ-14 through AQ-20 would minimize operational emissions from facilities.

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for new facilities and expansion of existing facilities to result in conflicts with the air quality management plan, and applied mitigation measures (AQ-1 through AQ-13 for facility construction, and measures AQ-14 through AQ-20 for facility operations) to reduce potential conflicts with air quality plans to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and the types of equipment and materials used to construct enclosures would be the similar to equipment needed to construct new or expand existing facilities, but with fewer numbers of equipment.

The certified Program EIR evaluated temporary impacts to air quality due to construction, which included fugitive dust from soil disturbing construction activities, as well as emissions from construction equipment, delivery and material hauling trucks, employee vehicles, and paints and coatings. Construction emissions vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of construction activity, which varies by construction phase (page 3-14 of the Program EIR).

The certified Program EIR assumed that emissions from construction of new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would exceed all of the construction significance thresholds, which could occur only under a worst-case construction emission scenario for new or expanded facilities. The worst-case construction phases that typically emit the most emissions is either the site preparation phase (grading, excavation, and associated haul away of soil), or the facility construction phase with large concrete placement, such as work pads, when the daily emission of pollutants from equipment and haul or concrete trucks are greatest compared to other subsequent construction phases. The Program EIR even applied mitigation measure AQ-4 to facility construction (page 3-22) to limit excavation, grading, and other construction activity to one phase at a time to reduce daily construction emissions.

Construction of enclosures would generate fewer emissions during the construction phase than what was assumed in the Program EIR because the facility enclosures would require less site preparation (if any), fewer haul trips, fewer concrete trips, and fewer numbers of equipment compared to construction of a new or expanded facility. Thus, maximum daily emissions from construction of enclosures would be less than that assumed in the certified Program EIR. Construction of FCP elements would therefore not exceed the worst-case emissions or construction assumptions in the certified Program EIR. In addition, the enclosures would simply house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin),

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	21	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), which might otherwise occur in the open. Enclosing the facilities is not expected to substantially increase facility foot prints or otherwise result in substantive additional operational emissions, as the enclosures would merely house designated work areas and would not affect facility activities. Therefore, the FCP would not result additional potential to result in conflicts with the air quality management plan. No new significant impacts related to potential conflicts with the air quality management plan would occur and no new air quality effects would result that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts related to conflicts with the air quality management plan from those determined in the Program EIR.

b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the new and expanded facilities to result in violate any air quality standards, and determined the following:

- Temporary impacts include fugitive dust from soil disturbing construction activities, and gaseous emissions from construction equipment, delivery and material hauling trucks, employee vehicles, and paints and coatings.
- Emission from construction of new or expanded transfer stations, MRFs, Organics processing facilities, and new truck base yards are assumed to exceed significance thresholds, but Mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-13 would minimize construction emissions.
- Operational emissions from the potential new or expanded transfer stations, materials processing facilities, and new truck base yards are assumed to exceed significance thresholds; therefore, the new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, or truck base yards could result in exceedances of significance thresholds for criteria pollutants, and expose sensitive receptors to air pollutants. Mitigation measures AQ-14 through AQ-20 would minimize operational emissions from facilities.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would exceed criteria pollutant significance thresholds, even with mitigation measures (AQ-1 through AQ-13 for facility construction, and measures AQ-14 through AQ-20 for facility operations). Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and the types of equipment and materials used to construct enclosures would be similar to equipment needed to construct new or expanded facilities, but with fewer numbers of equipment. As discussed under Checklist Item III.a, above, maximum daily emissions from construction of enclosures would be less than that assumed in the certified Program EIR. Further, the enclosures would simply house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), which might otherwise occur in the open. Enclosing the facilities is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints or otherwise result in substantive additional operational emissions, as the enclosures would merely house designated work areas and would not affect facility processing activities. Therefore, the FCP would not result in additional potential to violate air quality significance thresholds. No new

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	22	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

significant impacts to air quality would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects related to air quality from those determined in the Program EIR.

c. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the new and expanded facilities to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, and determined the following:

- Construction and operation of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, or truck base yards could result in emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds.
- Future stationary source emissions from the facilities would further contribute to exceedances to the SCAQMD thresholds, in conjunction with emissions from related projects.
- Implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-21 would reduce the construction and operational emissions associated with future facilities; however, residual impacts that contribute to a cumulative impact could remain. Therefore, a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact is identified.

The certified Program EIR determined that construction and operational emissions of new facilities and expanded existing facilities could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant even with application of mitigation measures (AQ-1 through AQ-13 for facility construction, and measures AQ-14-AQ-21 for facility operations). Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

As discussed under Checklist Items III.a. and III.b. above, the FCP would not result in new significant criteria pollutant impacts or an increase in the severity of impacts to air quality, and would not result in additional potential to violate air quality significance thresholds. Therefore, the FCP would not result in new or substantially more severe cumulatively considerable net increases in air pollutants that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new cumulatively considerable environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of cumulatively considerable effects related to air quality from those determined in the Program EIR.

d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the new and expanded facilities to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and determined the following:

- Construction impacts of the potential new or expanded transfer stations, MRFs, Organics processing facilities, and new truck base yards were evaluated conceptually in this document. Emissions from construction of these facilities are assumed to exceed significance thresholds.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	23	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

- Operational emissions from the potential new or expanded transfer stations, materials processing facilities, and new truck base yards are assumed to exceed significance thresholds and therefore, could expose sensitive receptors to air pollutants.
- Emissions from these facilities operation will be further addressed in the project specific environmental document prepared by the lead agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located when the specific new or expanded facilities operation are proposed and better defined. Mitigation measures AQ-14 through AQ-20 would minimize operational emissions from facilities.
- Potential health risks associated with future facilities would be addressed in the project-specific environmental document prepared by the lead agency for the jurisdiction in which such new or expanded facilities are located at the time when the new or expanded facilities can be better defined.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could exceed criterial pollutant significance thresholds, and could expose sensitive receptors to air pollutants even with application of mitigation measures (AQ-1 through AQ-13 for facility construction, and measures AQ-14-AQ-20 for facility operations). Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and the types of equipment and materials used to construct enclosures would be similar to equipment needed to construct new or expanded facilities but with fewer numbers of equipment. As discussed under Checklist Item III.a above, maximum daily emissions from construction of enclosures would be less than that assumed in the certified Program EIR. Further, the enclosures would simply house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), which might otherwise occur in the open. Enclosing the facilities is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints or otherwise result in substantive additional operational emissions, as the enclosures would merely house designated work areas and would not affect facility activities. Therefore, the FCP would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial additional emissions. No new significant impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutants would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant air pollutant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects related to exposure of sensitive receptors to air pollutants from those determined in the Program EIR.

e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the new processing facilities and transfer stations to expose sensitive receptors to nuisance odors, and determined the following:

- New processing facilities and transfer stations could result in potentially significant odor impacts, depending on the location of the new facilities and whether sensitive receptors are located nearby. Mitigation measure AQ-21 would minimize odor impacts associated with operations of processing facilities and transfer stations.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result significant odor impacts and applied mitigation measure AQ-21 for facility

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	24	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

operations to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and the enclosures would house potential odor-emitting activities such as preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), which might otherwise occur in the open. The FCP also requires redundant odor controls for facilities that require enclosure. Thus, the FCP would not result in additional potential to create objectionable odors. No new significant impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to odors would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not expose sensitive receptors to new significant odor impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects related to exposure of sensitive receptors to odor from those determined in the Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.	Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X

d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s impacts to Biological Resources:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities).
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Biological Resource impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species under Impact BIO-1, and determined the following:

- Industrial areas and agricultural areas are designated in the City’s General Plan, are not located in Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), and are likely devoid of habitat required to support candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.
- 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, which could result in significant impacts to the designated species.

- Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 and BIO-2 would mitigate potential impacts to special-status species and their habitat to less than significant levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact (either directly or through habitat modifications) candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, and applied mitigation measures (BIO-1 and BIO-2) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities. Although enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of potentially affected habitat of candidate, sensitive, or special-status species. No new significant impacts related to impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species uses would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project have a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community under Impact BIO-2, and determined the following:

- Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan, are not located in SEAs, and do not support riparian habitat or natural communities.
- 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 significant impacts to riparian habitat or other natural community from construction-related disturbances and site development.
- Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 and BIO-2 would mitigate potential impacts to riparian habitat to less than significant levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, and applied mitigation measures (BIO-1 and BIO-2) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities. Although enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	27	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of potentially affected riparian habitat or other natural communities. No new significant impacts related to impacts on riparian habitat or other natural communities would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on riparian habitat or other natural communities from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts on federally protected wetlands under Impact BIO-3, and determined the following:

- 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 significant impacts to wetlands from construction-related disturbances and site development.
- Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 and BIO-2 would mitigate potential impacts to wetlands to less than significant levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact federally protected wetlands, and applied mitigation measures (BIO-1 and BIO-2) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities. Although enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of potentially affected wetlands. No new significant impacts related to impacts on wetlands would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts to wetlands from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	28	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

d. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts on wildlife movement under Impact BIO-4, and determined the following:

- Industrial areas and agricultural areas within the City are generally established in the applicable General Plan, are not located in SEAs, and are devoid of wildlife habitat.
- 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 result in significant impacts by interfering with the movement of any wildlife species or with a wildlife corridor.
- Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3 would mitigate potential impacts to wildlife movement to less than significant levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, and applied mitigation measures (BIO-1 and BIO-2) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities. Although enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not interfere with wildlife movement. No new significant impacts related to the interference of wildlife movement or impacts on wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery site would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on wildlife movement from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts on locally-protected biological resources, in particular protected trees, under Impact BIO-5, and determined the following:

- Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan and are generally devoid of protected trees.
- 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, the expanded or new transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards on lands zoned for industrial uses or agriculture could potentially result in significant impacts to protected trees from construction-related disturbances and site development.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	29	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

- Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-3 would mitigate potential impacts to protected trees to less than significant levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact locally-protected biological resources such as protected trees, and applied mitigation measure BIO-3 to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities. Although enclosing facilities would have the effect of completely housing preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase potential impact to protected trees. No new significant impacts on protected trees would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on protected trees from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural communities conservation plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential conflicts with an adopted habitat conservation plan under Impact BIO-6, and determined the following:

- 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, and would not in impacts related to conflicts with habitat or natural community conservation plans.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not likely impact adopted habitat conservation plans, natural communities’ conservation plans, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and would not cause such facilities to be sited within an adopted habitat conservation plan area. Although enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Thus, the FCP would not result in impacts related to conflicts with habitat or natural community conservation plans, consistent with the certified Program EIR. No new significant

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	30	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

impacts related to conflicts with habitat or natural community conservation plans would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on habitat or natural community conservation plans from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				X
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s impacts to Cultural Resources:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities).
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Cultural Resource impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts to historical resources under Impact CUL-1, and determined the following:

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	31	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

- 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. Without site-specific information, whether or not the future facilities would adversely affect historic resources cannot be determined at this time.
- However, future facilities could still result in significant cumulative impacts to historical resources because whereas local regulations provide for the mitigation of impacts, they do not explicitly prohibit the demolition or alteration of historical resources. Impacts to historic resources from the siting of facilities and truck base yards would be evaluated when a specific facility is proposed.
- Mitigation measure CUL-4 was applied to new and expanded facilities that could result in alternation or demolition of historic resources, but significant impacts could remain.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could significantly impact historic resources even with application of mitigation because regulations do not preclude their alteration or demolition. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore would not require their relocation to sites that contains historic resources. Although enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not likely result in additional impacts to historic properties. No new significant impacts to historic resources would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on historic resources from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts to archaeological resources under Impact CUL-2, and determined the following:

- 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 determined at this time.
- Mitigation measure CUL-1 was applied to new and expanded facilities that could result in earth-disturbing activities involving native sediments with the potential for producing archaeological materials to reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	32	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact archaeological resources, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore would not require their relocation to sites that contains archaeological resources. As summarized under Checklist Item III.a above, construction of the facility enclosures would require less excavation and grading compared to construction of a new or expanded facility. Further, enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), and are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not likely result in additional impacts to archaeological resources. No new significant impacts to archaeological resources would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on archaeological resources from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts to paleontological resources under Impact CUL-3, and determined the following:

- 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 determined at this time.
- Mitigation measure CUL-2 was applied to new and expanded facilities that could excavate into alluvial sediments (e.g., Older Quaternary Alluvium deposits) or bedrock formations to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to a less than significant level.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could impact paleontological resources, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore would not require their relocation to sites that contains paleontological resources. Although enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not likely result in additional impacts to paleontological resources. No new significant impacts to paleontological resources would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	33	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on paleontological resources from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential impacts to paleontological resources under Impact CUL-3, and determined the following:

- 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, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in significant impacts related to encountering interred human remains. 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 determined at this time. Impacts to archaeological resources from the siting of facilities and truck base yards would be evaluated when a specific facility is proposed.
- Mitigation measure CUL-3 was applied to new and expanded facilities in the event that human remains are encountered during facility construction to keep impacts below the level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could encounter human remains, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosure of new and existing facilities under the FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore, would not require their relocation to sites that may contain human remains. Although enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not likely result in additional impacts to human remains. No new significant impacts on human remains would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on human remains from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

	Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i.) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
	ii.) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
	iii.) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
	iv.) Landslides?				X
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				X
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program's Geology and Soils impacts:

- Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, new truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities would have to comply with local land use plans and zoning requirements of the jurisdiction in which they are located and with the applicable building code, seismic code, and local building permit requirements.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Geology and Soils impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

(i.) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to expose people or structures to adverse effects related to rupture of a known earthquake fault under Impact GEO-1, and determined the following:

- Local land use planning and code requirements generally include preparation of geotechnical studies and compliance with associated geotechnical recommendations to minimize potential impacts associated with seismic activities and known or unknown faults, and from other geological hazards.
- 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, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities are constructed in proximity to active mapped faults, a potentially significant impact could occur.
- Implementation of mitigation measure GS-1 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could expose people or structures to adverse effects related to rupture of a known earthquake fault, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore would not require their relocation to sites that may within a fault rupture zone. The enclosures would be subject to compliance with applicable building and seismic codes, and therefore would not expose people or property to additional risks associated with fault rupture zones. No new significant impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from rupture of a known earthquake fault would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from the exposure of people or structures to a known earthquake fault from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

(ii.) Strong seismic ground shaking?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to expose people or structures to adverse effects due to seismic ground shaking under Impact GEO-2, and determined the following:

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	36	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

- Local land use planning and code requirements generally include preparation of geotechnical studies and compliance with associated geotechnical recommendations to minimize potential impacts associated with seismic ground shaking.
- However, the locations of future facilities are unknown at this time. Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities could be constructed in locations that expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects resulting from strong seismic ground shaking.
- Implementation of mitigation measure GS-2 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance. Under mitigation measure GS-2, a site-specific geotechnical report would be prepared in areas subject to earthquake-induced landslides or liquefaction, as mandated by the State Seismic Hazard Mapping Act at the time a site is selected for a new or expanded facility. Further mitigation measures and design recommendations identified in those site-specific reports would be implemented to minimize the potential for injury and loss related to earthquake-induced landslides, liquefaction, or seismic hazards.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could expose people or structures to adverse effects due to seismic ground shaking, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and any enclosure improvements would be subject to local building- and seismic-code compliance. Therefore, the FCP would not result in additional exposure of people or property to substantial adverse effects from seismic ground shaking. No new significant impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to strong seismic ground shaking would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from the exposure of people or structures to strong seismic ground shaking from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

(iii.) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to expose people or structures to adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure under Impact GEO-3, and determined the following:

- Local land use planning and code requirements generally include preparation of geotechnical studies and compliance with associated geotechnical recommendations to minimize potential impacts associated with seismic activity and seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.
- However, the locations of future facilities are unknown at this time; future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities could be constructed in locations that expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects resulting from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Implementation of mitigation measures GS-2 and GS-3 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	37	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could expose people or structures to adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and any enclosure improvements would be subject to local building- and seismic-code compliance. Therefore, the FCP would not result in additional exposure of people or property to substantial adverse effects associated with seismic ground failure. No new significant impacts related to the exposure of people or structures seismic-related ground failure would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from the exposure of people or structures to seismic-related ground failure from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

(iv.) Landslides?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to expose people or structures to adverse effects related to landslides under Impact GEO-4, and determined the following:

- Local land use planning and code requirements generally include preparation of geotechnical studies and compliance with associated geotechnical recommendations to minimize potential impacts associated with geologic hazards such as landslides.
- However, the locations of future facilities are unknown at this time. Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities could be constructed in locations that expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects resulting from landslides. Implementation of mitigation measures GS-2 and GS-4 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could expose people or structures to adverse effects due to landslides, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and any enclosures would be subject to local building- and seismic-code compliance. Therefore, the FCP would not result in additional exposure of people or property to landslides. No new significant impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to landslides would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from the exposure of people or structures to landslides from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil under Impact GEO-5, and determined the following:

recyclLA – Facility Certification Program	38	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
---	----	---

- Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, new truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities would have to comply with applicable building and water quality regulations that require minimization of soil erosion and loss of top soil. 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 BMPs, which would be required as part of the SWPPP, would keep potential erosion impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil due to compliance with an applicable SWPPP and associated BMPs. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would require facility enclosures, but they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not require substantive changes to any SWPPP and would not preclude the implementation of required BMPs. No new significant impacts from soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from soil erosion or the loss of topsoil from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Is the project located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in or be sited in areas subject to unstable geologic conditions under Impact GEO-6, and determined the following:

- Local land use planning and code requirements generally include preparation of geotechnical studies and compliance with associated geotechnical recommendations to minimize potential impacts associated with unstable geologic conditions, including landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, and liquefaction or collapse.
- However, the locations of future facilities are unknown at this time. Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities could be constructed on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project. Implementation of mitigation measure GS-2 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in or be site in areas with unstable geologic conditions, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and any enclosure improvements would be subject to local building- and seismic-code compliance. Therefore, the

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	39	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

FCP would not result in additional result in unstable geologic conditions. No new significant impacts related to unstable geologic conditions would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from unstable geologic conditions from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

d. Is the project located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994),¹ creating substantial risks to life or property?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in substantial risks to life or property from exposure to expansive soils under Impact GEO-7, and determined the following:

- Local land use planning and code requirements generally include preparation of geotechnical studies and compliance with associated geotechnical recommendations to minimize potential impacts associated with adverse ground conditions, including expansive soils.
- However, the locations of future facilities are unknown at this time; future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities could be constructed on an area with expansive soil. Implementation of mitigation measure GS-2 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in risks to life or property from exposure to expansive soils, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

¹ The State of California provides minimum standards for building design through the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC is based on the International Building Code (formerly known as the Uniform Building Code), established by the International Code Council (formerly known as the International Council of Building Officials), which is used widely throughout the U.S. (generally adopted on a state-by-state or agency-by-agency basis), and has been modified for conditions within California. Therefore, this Checklist assumes compliance with the CBC.

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	40	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and any enclosure improvements would be subject to local building- and seismic-code compliance. Therefore, enclosing the facilities would not result in additional impacts related to expansive soils. No new significant impacts related to expansive soils would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from expansive soils from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

e. Would the project have soils that are incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in impacts to soils as a result of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems under Impact GEO-8, and determined the following:

- Future new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and new truck base yards, would require the provision of various utilities and are, therefore, likely to be located in industrial areas or areas currently serviced by a traditional wastewater collection system (e.g., a sewer service that conveys wastewater to a wastewater treatment plant for processing). Because of this, the expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities and truck base yards in industrial areas would not use alternative wastewater disposal systems, including septic systems, which could adversely affect surrounding soil. Organics processing facilities could be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.
- The City has limited agricultural land in the Sepulveda Basin and at Pierce College in the San Fernando Valley. Additionally, there are large agricultural areas near the City. 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; however, the majority of agricultural areas are 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, soil testing would be required to determine if the permeability of the soil is adequate to support the use of a 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could utilize septic systems or other alternative wastewater disposal systems, but that significant impacts on soils would not occur due to required soils permeability testing. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not directly generate additional wastewater, and would not require any facility process changes that could generate increased wastewater (the enclosures would merely house the area where processing occurs). Therefore, the FCP would not result in additional impacts to soil from the use of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No new significant impacts on soils from the use of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	41	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts on soils related to the use of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.	Would the project:				
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b.	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

Discussion:

a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to generate greenhouse gas emission that could significantly affect the environment of conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under Impact GHG-1 and GHG-2, and determined the following:

- The Proposed Project could involve construction and operation of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and new truck base yards. New or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, and truck base yards are expected to be sited on lands with industrial or commercial manufacturing zoning designation, but could include lands zoned for agricultural uses for Organics processing facilities. From a conceptual perspective, 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.
- The new or expanded facilities are not likely to be classified as a major source of GHG emissions. Therefore, GHG emissions from new or expanded facilities are not expected to generate significant levels of GHG emissions or conflict with GHG plans or policies.
- Further evaluation of GHG emissions from facilities will be addressed in the project specific environmental document prepared by the applicable Lead Agency.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not generate significant levels of GHG emissions or conflict with GHG plans or policies.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	42	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

GHG impacts are usually evaluated in terms of a quantity of CO₂e per year, and as discussed in the certified Program EIR, the majority of GHG emissions are generated from the transportation sector. For projects where the SCAQMD is the Lead Agency, GHG emissions from construction are amortized over 30-year periods (SCAQMD, 2008). Construction of enclosures would be additive to GHG emission assumptions in the PEIR, but would not result in a new or substantially more severe significant GHG impact because the FCP’s facility enclosures would represent a minor element of the overall processing facilities and transfer stations, and similar to the evaluation in the certified Program EIR, their annual GHG emissions would be negligible relative to the Statewide GHG emissions of 488.1 million metric tons of in 2011 and the emission goal of 427 MMT per year in 2020 established by AB32. In addition, the FCP would not result in process changes that would generate substantial additional GHG emissions, as the enclosures would simply house facility operations. Therefore, the FCP would not result in substantial additional GHG emissions. No new significant impacts from GHG emissions would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant GHG impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of GHG emissions from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The evaluation under herein is the same as under Checklist Item VII.a. above.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school?				X

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program's Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts:

- Future new or expanded processing facilities and new or expanded 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).
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	44	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials under Impact HAZ-1, and determined the following:

- 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, 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.
- Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials from the siting of facilities and truck base yards would be evaluated when a specific facility is proposed. However, it is expected that mandatory compliance with all applicable regulations involving the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous substances would minimize impacts during the construction and operation of the future facilities.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not require the routine use of hazardous materials, and would not result in process changes that would use or discharge hazardous materials, as the enclosures would simply house facility operations. Therefore, the FCP would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No new significant impacts related to the routine use of hazardous materials would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant hazardous material impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of hazardous materials impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving a likely accidental release of hazardous materials under Impact HAZ-2, and determined the following:

- Although unlikely in agricultural areas, operations in industrial areas may use various heavy equipment to move and process recyclable and Organics. 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.
- Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials from the siting of facilities and truck base yards would be further evaluated when a specific facility is proposed.

recyclLA – Facility Certification Program	45	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
---	----	---

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving a likely accidental release of hazardous materials. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not require facility process changes that would in turn use or store hazardous materials, as the enclosures would simply house facility operations. Therefore, the FCP would not result in the accidental release of hazardous materials that could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No new significant impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant or a substantial increase in the severity of an accidental release of hazardous materials from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school under Impact HAZ-2, and determined the following:

- Future new or expanded processing facilities and new or expanded truck base yards would have various heavy equipment used to move and process recyclables and Organics. New or expanded truck base yards would store heavy vehicles. 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.
- The Air Quality Management Districts (AQMD) regulate emissions according to the geographic area and potential sensitive receptors. Emissions from the construction and operation of future facilities would be assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine if siting of waste, processing or handling facilities is protective of existing and future school students and staff within one-quarter mile. Furthermore, facilities would likely be sited on industrial zoned land; industrial areas are not generally located near schools.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste that could affect an existing or proposed school. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not require facility activity changes that could result in the emission of hazardous pollutants. Therefore, the FCP would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school. No new significant impacts related to hazardous emissions that could affect a school would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	46	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity impacts related to the emission of hazardous substances from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

d. Is the project located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to site Program elements on a designated hazardous material site under Impact HAZ-4, and determined the following:

- Although industrial activities frequently use hazardous materials in various industrial processes, whether an industrial parcel or site is contaminated is a function of the historical use of that site and the business practices of the previous operators. Until such time as the locations for new processing facilities, including Organics, and truck base yards are identified, whether those future processing facility sites and truck base yards are listed as hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or otherwise contaminated, cannot yet be determined. Similarly, the nature of any contamination at a future processing facility cannot be determined at this time. Due this uncertainty of where future facilities would be located, there is a potential that the facility could be located on or adjacent to a site that is listed by DTSC as needing corrective action. This represents a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measure HAZ-1 has been identified, which will reduce this impact to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities might occur on a listed hazardous materials site or a site that has been contaminated from historic uses, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore would not require their relocation to sites that may contain hazardous materials. Although enclosing facilities would house preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints because they would merely house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, enclosing the facilities is not expected to create additional significant hazards to the public or the environment. No new significant impacts related to designated hazardous materials sites would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts related to designated hazardous materials sites from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in safety hazards to people as a result of locating Program elements within a designated airport land use plan or within 2 miles of an airport under Impact HAZ-5, and determined the following:

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	47	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

- The potential for these future facilities to conflict with an airport land use plan, or operations at a public airport is dependent upon where future facilities are sited. Due to the uncertainty at this time, a potentially significant impact related to potential safety hazards due to proximity to public airports is identified. Mitigation measures HAZ-2 has been identified to reduce potentially significant impacts to airports to a less than significant level. Future facilities would be subject to additional review pursuant to CEQA, and any potential conflicts with existing airports would be identified.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities might occur within a designated airport land use plan or within 2 miles of an airport, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore would not require their relocation to sites within an airport land use area. Enclosure of facilities would effectively isolate facility activities from open air exposure, and would not represent a safety hazard to aircraft or for people residing or working in the area. Therefore, the FCP is not expected to create additional significant hazards to the public related to proximity to an airport. No new significant impacts related to facility proximity to an airport land use plan or vicinity of an airport would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant safety hazards related to proximity to an airport from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

f. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in safety hazards to people as a result of locating Program elements within a the vicinity of a private airstrip under Impact HAZ-6, and determined the following:

- Processing facilities and truck base yards would be located in industrial areas, which could occur within the vicinity of a private airport. The potential for these future facilities to result in potential safety hazards due to proximity to a private airport is dependent upon where future facilities are sited. Due to the uncertainty at this time, a potentially significant impact to airports is identified. Mitigation measures HAZ-2 has been identified to reduce potentially significant impacts to airports to a less than significant level. Future facilities would be subject to additional review pursuant to CEQA, and any potential conflicts with existing airports would be identified.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities might occur within the vicinity of a private airstrip and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore would not require their relocation to sites within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Enclosures would effectively isolate facility activities from open air exposure, and would not represent a safety hazard to aircraft or for people residing or working in the area. Therefore, the FCP is not expected to create additional significant hazards to the public related to proximity to a private airstrip. No new significant impacts related to facility proximity to a private airstrip would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	48	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant safety hazards related proximity to a private airstrip from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

g. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan under Impact HAZ-7, and determined the following:

- The Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans & Inventory Act requires facilities using hazardous materials or generating hazardous wastes to prepare Business Emergency Plans. These plans specify storage, secondary containment and proper hazardous material and waste management procedures and practices, including personnel training and emergency response actions to contain, cleanup and report unauthorized releases or spills. In addition, the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) was enacted to help communities protect public health, safety, and the environment from chemical hazards. To implement SARA, California has been divided into emergency planning districts. Each district has identified a local emergency planning committee. 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. This represents a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measure HAZ-3 through HAZ-7 have been identified, which will reduce this impact to below a level of significance. These mitigation measures require that, upon approval of future facilities, an applicable community emergency plan shall be developed, reviewed and updated, as needed, to account for new waste facilities and updated routes for the transportation of hazardous wastes.

The certified Program EIR determined that for new facilities and expansion of existing facilities, community emergency plans may need to be reviewed and updated depending on the types of materials they handle or store, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and would not result in process changes that could require use or storage of materials considered hazardous, as the enclosures would merely house facility activities from open air exposure. Therefore, the FCP is not expected to require changes to Business Emergency Plans. No new significant impacts would occur from enclosures that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

h. Would the project expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	49	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires under Impact HAZ-8, and determined the following:

- Industrial and agricultural areas in the City are generally devoid of and not located near wildlands. However, due to the uncertainty of where future facilities would be located, 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. Mitigation measure HAZ-8 has been identified, which will reduce this impact to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires depending on where the facilities are located, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore would not require their relocation to sites subject to wildfires. The enclosures are expected to reduce the exposure of facility employees to wildfires, as facility activities and employees would be housed within the enclosures. Therefore, the FCP is not expected to result in additional exposure of people or property to wildfires. No new significant impacts would occur from enclosures that could expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
	Would the project:				
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site?			X	
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site?			X	
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i.	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?				X
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program's impacts on Hydrology and Water Quality:

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	51	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

- Future new or expanded processing facilities and new or expanded 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).
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Hydrology and Water Quality impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements under Impact WQ-1, and determined the following:

- Future new and/or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely have impervious surfaces that would generate runoff. Because these facilities could have residual Solid Wastes in recyclables and Organics, 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.
- Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-1, WQ-2, and WQ-3 described below, would mitigate potential impacts to water quality to less-than-significant levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that runoff from new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could contain contaminants from facility activities that could enter waterways and receiving waters, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and is expected to reduce the potential that runoff could be tainted by facility contaminants, as facility activities would be housed within the required enclosures; thereby decreasing the possibility that stormwater runoff could become polluted from the processes. No new significant impacts would occur from enclosures that could violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	52	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge under Impact WQ-2, and determined the following:

- 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not encroach on designated groundwater recharge areas and would not utilize groundwater extraction as a water source for operations. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosure of new and existing facilities under the FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not require their relocation areas designated for groundwater recharge. In addition, enclosures would merely house facility activities, and would not result in process changes or otherwise require extraction of groundwater. Therefore, the FCP would not adversely affect groundwater recharge or supplies. No new significant impacts would occur from the FCP that could deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to alter drainage patterns that could result in substantial erosion or siltation under Impact WQ-3, and determined the following:

- 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.
- Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-4 and WQ-5 would mitigate potential drainage-related impacts to less-than-significant levels. 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that runoff from new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in erosion or siltation if downstream drainage facilities are unlined channels or otherwise have natural features, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	53	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not require the relocation of facilities to areas where downstream drainage infrastructure is unlined. Enclosing facilities under the FCP is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, as the enclosures would merely need to house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of site runoff and would not result in substantial soil erosion. No new significant impacts from enclosures causing substantial erosion or siltation would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in substantial erosion or siltation from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

d. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to alter drainage patterns that could result in flooding on site or off site under Impact WQ-4, and determined the following:

- Development of facilities 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. Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-4 and WQ-5, described below, would mitigate potential flooding impacts to less than significant levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that runoff from new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in downstream flooding if the capacities of the downstream drainage facilities are exceeded, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and would therefore not require the relocation of facilities to an area where downstream drainage infrastructure is constrained. Enclosing facilities under the FCP is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, as the enclosures would merely need to house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of site runoff and would not result in flooding. No new significant impacts from enclosures would occur that would substantially increase the potential for flooding that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in a substantial increase in the potential for flooding from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

e. Would the project create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	54	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems under Impact WQ-5, and determined the following:

- Development of facilities 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.
- Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-4, WQ-5, and WQ-6 described below, would mitigate potential impacts to storm drain capacity to less-than-significant levels. 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that runoff from new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could contribute to runoff flows that exceed the capacity of existing storm drains, if the storm drain capacities are constrained, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not require the relocation of facilities to an area where downstream storm drain capacity is constrained. Enclosing facilities under the FCP is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, as the enclosures would merely need to house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of site runoff and would not result in stormwater flows that exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems. No new significant impacts from enclosures would occur that would substantively increase the potential to exceed the capacity of existing downstream storm drains that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in a substantive increase in the potential to exceed the capacity of existing downstream storm drains from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

The evaluation under herein is the same as under Checklist Item IX.a. above.

g. Would the project place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to place housing within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area under Impact WQ-7, and determined the following:

- 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not place any housing in any flood zone or flood hazard area, as the facilities would be

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	55	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

used only to process diverted materials from landfills or facilitate. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

FCP would not include a housing component, and would therefore not place housing within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area. No new significant impacts related to the placement of housing in flood hazard areas would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in significant impacts from the placement of any housing in a flood zone or flood hazard area from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

h. Would the project place within a 100-year floodplain structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to impede or redirect flood flows under Impact WQ-8, and determined the following:

- Future new and/or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas that could be located in 100-year flood hazard areas, depending on how the applicable General Plan has allocated land use. Runoff is generally conveyed away from developed sites through the storm drain system to designated stormwater conveyance channels, which are usually concrete-lined unless they are located in areas of high groundwater or they are located in the upstream areas of the watershed. 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.
- Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-7, WQ-8, and WQ-9 described below, would mitigate potential flood-related impacts from Project facilitates to less-than-significant levels. 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that runoff from new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could have a remote potential to add to a flooding hazard that could redirect flood flows, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not require the relocation of facilities to a flood plain. Enclosing facilities under the FCP is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, as the enclosures would merely need to house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of site runoff and would not impede flood flows. No new significant impacts related to impeding or redirecting flood flows would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	56	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in a substantive increase in the potential to redirect flood flows from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

i. Would the project 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?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding under Impact WQ-9, and determined the following:

- Future new and/or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be developed in industrial areas due to the industrial nature of the facilities, or on agricultural lands in the case of Organics facilities, which could be subject to inundation in the event of flood from natural or dam or levee failure. However, 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.
- Government Code Section 65302(g) requires general plans to include a safety element for the protection of the community from any unreasonable risks associated with the effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, and dam failure; slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides; subsidence and other known geologic hazards. The safety elements are the primary mechanism for relating local safety planning to City and county land use decisions, and cities and counties establish land use planning policies, standards, and designations based on the criteria set forth in the safety element of their general plan. Because 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, as the facilities would be designed to applicable flood management and building code requirements, and because the Safety Elements of the applicable General Plans incorporate policies that address the safety concerns. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not increase the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. No new significant impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	57	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

j. Would the project contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to contribute to inundation under Impact WQ-10, and determined the following:

- Future new and/or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would likely be located in industrial areas due to the industrial nature of the facilities, or on agricultural lands in the case of Organics facilities. 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not result in significant inundation impacts due to lack of proximity and/or planning measures that are in place. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosure of new and existing facilities under the FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and would therefore not increase the exposure to inundation. No new significant impacts related to the potential to increase inundation risks would occur from enclosing facilities under the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not increase inundation risks from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	58	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a.	Physically divide an established community?				X
b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s Land Use impacts:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities), which are generally established in the applicable General Plan and which are reflected in the underlying zoning designation of industrial parcels.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Land Use impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to physically divide an established community under Impact LU-1, and determined the following:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities), which are generally established in the applicable General Plans. 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not physically divide an established community, as the facilities would be located in areas designated within a General Plan. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and would not represent improvements that could conflict with a General Plan or physically divide an established community. Therefore, no new significant impacts would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not physically divide an established community and would not result in additional land use impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential conflict with applicable land use plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect under Impact LU-2 and determined the following:

- Siting of the expanded or new processing facilities and truck base yards on industrial lands is not expected to result in conflicts with the applicable General Plan or the zoning designation of the future sites. Organics processing facilities could be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.
- However, the locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time. Depending on the type of facility, potential impacts to land use would occur if a new or expanded transfer station, processing facility, truck base yard or Organics processing facility 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. At the time a location is identified to site a new or expanded facility, the proposed facility would be subject to the applicable land use plans, policies, or regulation of the agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, redevelopment plan, interim control ordinance, habitat/community conservation plan, or zoning ordinance) for the respective jurisdiction.
- The project-level mitigation identified for the project, LU-1 through LU-3, is designed to minimize the potential for land use impacts at the project-level and would also reduce potential impacts to less than significant level.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could conflict with applicable land use plans and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities. Enclosing facilities would have the effect of completely housing preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities, which is expected decrease potential conflicts with land use plans and nearby areas that might be

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	60	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

incompatible to such facilities. Therefore, no new significant impacts related to the potential conflicts with adopted land use plans would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not conflict with adopted land use plans and would not result in additional land use impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?

The certified Program EIR evaluated potential conflicts with applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan under Impact LU-3 and determined the following:

Industrial areas or on land zoned for industrial uses are not subject to habitat management plans or natural community conservation plans that seek to preserve habitat of value in its natural state. Organics processing facilities could be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

- The locations of future new or expanded facilities are unknown at this time. Depending on the type of facility, potential impacts to land use would occur if a new or expanded transfer station, processing facility, 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. At the time a location is identified to site a new or expanded facility, the proposed facility would be subject to the applicable land use plans, policies, or regulation of the agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, redevelopment plan, interim control ordinance, habitat/community conservation plan, or zoning ordinance) for the respective jurisdiction.
- The project-level mitigation identified for the Proposed Project, LU-1 through LU-3, is designed to minimize the potential for land use impacts at the project-level and would potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could conflict with habitat conservation and/or natural communities conservation plans and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not require the relocation of facilities to an area subject to a habitat conservation plan. Enclosing facilities would have the effect of completely housing preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities, which is expected decrease potential conflicts with habitat conservation plan or natural communities’ conservation land use plans, if any, and nearby areas that might be incompatible to such facilities. No new significant impacts related to the potential conflicts with habitat conservation and/or natural communities conservation plans would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not conflict with habitat conservation and/or natural

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	61	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

communities' conservation plans and would not result in additional impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.	Would the project:				
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program's impacts on Mineral Resources:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities).
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Mineral Resources impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential loss of availability of a known mineral resource under Impact MR-1 and determined the following:

- 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. As future facilities are proposed, they would be subject to additional review pursuant to CEQA. At that time, the potential site-specific impacts would be analyzed.
- If future facilities were proposed in areas that support oil well or gas wells, there is potential for an impact. The presence of oil or gas in the subsurface can be toxic and would be a major consideration for future Solid Resource facility siting. If the siting of a future facility is within an area supporting oil or gas wells, coordination with the Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR)

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	62	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

District 1 would be required. The local permitting agency in coordination with DOGGR District 1 would conduct a Construction Site Review. The Construction Site Review process varies depending on where the land is being developed.

- 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 or local jurisdictions, 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 certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in the potential loss of availability of a known mineral resource and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosure of new and existing facilities under the FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities, and therefore, would not require the relocation of facilities to sites that contain mineral resources. Enclosing such facilities would have no substantive effect on the availability of mineral resources, as they would merely house planned or existing facility activities. No new significant impacts related to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource and would not result in additional impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project 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?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential loss of availability of a designated locally important mineral resource recovery site under Impact MR-2 and determined the following:

- 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. Given the uncertainty of the facility locations, the Proposed Project could result in a significant impact. As future facilities are proposed, they would be subject to additional review pursuant to CEQA. Part of that analysis would include a review of any applicable general plans, specific plans, or other land use plans to identify any locally important mineral resources. With implementation of mitigation measures MR-1 through MR-4, it is anticipated that project level impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in the potential loss of availability of a designated locally important mineral resource recovery site and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not require the relocation of facilities to sites that contain locally important mineral resources. Enclosing such facilities would have no substantive effect on the availability of mineral

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	63	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

resources, as they would merely house planned or existing facility activities. No new significant impacts related to the loss of availability of a designated locally important mineral resource recovery site would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in a loss of availability of a designated locally important mineral resource recovery site and would not result in additional impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE.	Would the project:				
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s Noise impacts:

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	64	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities).
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Noise impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the Program to expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards under Impact NOI-1 and determined the following:

- Industrial, manufacturing, and agricultural areas can have a noise level (CNEL) up to 74 dBA before the area is considered unacceptable, for purposes of considering land use siting. Activities at locations of future processing capacity, transfer stations, and truck base yards would include use of heavy equipment and/or heavy vehicles, which could be operated indoors or outdoors, and potentially, could be operated at night. In addition, trips to and from the facilities, transfer stations and truck base yards would result in additional traffic noise. Ambient noise levels in industrial areas are generally a function of uses at the site, noise levels from nearby industrial uses, proximity to other noise sources such as highways and freeways, and the presence or absence of intervening structures that attenuate sound levels. 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.
- Construction activities for future facilities will vary depending on the type of facility, but it is assumed that some type of grading and excavating would occur to prepare the site for structures. Additionally, equipment will be used to construct the facility and could include equipment such as cranes, concrete saws and pneumatic tools. Construction-related traffic, including construction crew trips and material deliveries are additional sources of noise associated with facility construction. Most of the heavy equipment that produces the highest noise levels would be in use during the excavation and grading phases of construction, as well as during the finishing phase of construction.
- Therefore, there is a potential for new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities and truck base yards to result in significant noise impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures N-1 and N-7 would mitigate potential noise impacts to less than significant levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not relocate facilities to areas with more stringent noise standards. The enclosure of facilities under the FCP would likely reduce noise generated by the facility activities by shielding and

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	65	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

attenuating operational noise. As summarized under Checklist Item III.a above, the Program EIR evaluated worst-case construction assumptions for air pollutant emissions from new facilities and expansion of existing facilities. The worst-case phase for generation of construction noise would be the same as for air quality, due to the use of heavy construction equipment and the presence of numerous haul and/or cement trucks. The certified Program EIR assumed that noise from construction of new and expanded facilities would exceed applicable noise standards or significance thresholds. The worst-case construction phases that generates the highest noise is typically either the site preparation phase (grading, excavation, and associated haul away of soil), or the facility construction phase with large concrete placement, such as work pads, the use of heavy equipment and trucks are the greatest compared to other construction phases. Construction of enclosures would generate less noise than what was assumed in the Program EIR because the facility enclosures would require less site preparation, fewer haul trips, fewer concrete trips, and fewer numbers of equipment compared to construction of a new or expanded facility. Thus, construction of FCP elements would not exceed the worst-case noise generation assumptions in the certified Program EIR. No new significant impacts related to the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards and would not result in additional impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise under Impact NOI-2, and determined the following:

- The construction of new or expanded processing facilities, transfer stations and truck base yards would involve excavation activities using heavy equipment, and could result in some vibrations and groundborne noise to nearby structures. However, potential vibration levels would likely be below levels that can cause damage to nearby structures. In addition, vibrations associated with processing activities and truck base yards would be consistent with those typically found in industrial and manufacturing areas. As a result, new processing capacity and truck base yards are not expected to result in excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Therefore, the propose project is not expected to result in significant impacts due to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not result in excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The construction of enclosures for new and existing facilities under the FCP would require similar (but fewer) construction equipment as needed for the overall construction of the facilities, and would not result in excessive groundborne noise or vibration. In addition, the enclosures would not require process changes, and would therefore not result in operational groundborne noise or vibration. Therefore, no new significant groundborne noise and vibration impacts would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	66	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not to expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise, and would not result in additional impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the Program to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels under Impact NOI-4 and determined the following:

- Construction activities would be short-term and therefore not anticipated to cause a substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise level. Activities at locations of future processing capacity, transfer stations and base yards would include use of heavy equipment and/or operation of heavy duty vehicles that could be operated indoors or outdoors, day or night, and as such, processing capacity sites could result in some elevated noise levels due to operations. Factors affecting noise levels from new facilities, transfer stations, and base yards include site layout, the height and composition of perimeter walls, noise suppression devices on equipment and vehicles, and other factors. In addition, trips to and from the facilities, transfer stations and truck base yards could result in elevated noise levels. Although elevated noise levels in industrial, manufacturing, and agricultural areas are not generally considered to be significant due the presence of noise-generating manufacturing activities, traffic, equipment, and the lack of proximity to sensitive receptors such as residences and schools, the specific noise settings associated with future facilities are unknown. 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. Implementation of mitigation measures N-1 and N-7, described below, would mitigate potential noise impacts to less than significant levels.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause such facilities to be located or relocated to areas with more stringent noise standards. The enclosure of facilities under the FCP would likely reduce noise generated by the facility activities by shielding and attenuating operational noise. Therefore, the FCP would not result in substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. No new significant impacts related to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

d. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	67	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the Program to result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels under Impact NOI-4 and determined the following:

- Activities at locations of future processing capacity, transfer stations, and truck base yards would include use of heavy equipment during construction, and as such, would result in temporary elevated noise levels in their vicinity. Elevated noise levels in industrial, manufacturing, and agricultural areas are not generally considered to be significant due to the presence of noise-generating manufacturing activities, traffic, equipment, and the lack of proximity to sensitive receptors such as residences and schools. However, in the event a facility, transfer station, or truck base yard are 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. Implementation of mitigation measures N-1 through N-6 would reduce potentially significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors resulting from facility construction to less than significant levels. 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels, and applied mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause such facilities to be located or relocated to areas with noise-sensitive receptors in the vicinity. The certified Program EIR assumed a worst-case construction noise scenario for new and expanded facilities where all applicable noise standards or significance thresholds would be exceeded. The worst-case construction phases that generates the highest noise is typically either the site preparation phase (grading, excavation, and associated haul away of soil), or the construction of facility work pads due to the presence of the heavy earth-moving equipment and numerous haul and/or concrete trucks. Construction of enclosures would likely require less equipment on site, fewer truck trips than the worst case construction phase, and would not generate noise that exceeds the worst-case construction phases. Thus, construction of FCP elements would not exceed the worst-case noise generation assumptions in the certified Program EIR. No new significant impacts related to a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels and would not result in additional impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for Program elements to be located within an airport land use plan or proximate to an airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels under Impact NOI-5 and determined the following:

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	68	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

- Airport land use plans generally limit industrial uses within the plan area to aviation-related industrial uses, which would generally preclude placement of processing facilities and truck base yards within such plan areas. Processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards are, therefore, 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.
- Implementation of mitigation measure N-8 would reduce this potential impact to below a level of significance. 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that facilities that would be located within an airport's high noise contour areas could expose employees to excessive noise levels, but that impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of mitigation measure NOI-8. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be "fully enclosed" to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause such facilities to be located or relocated to areas that may be exposed to high levels of aircraft noise. The enclosure of facilities under the FCP would likely reduce the level of aircraft noise that facility employees are exposed to by the shielding and attenuation effects of the enclosure material, relative to open air facilities. Therefore, the FCP would not expose people to excessive airport noise levels. No new significant impacts related to the exposure of facility employees to excessive aircraft noise would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in exposure of facility employees to excessive aircraft noise from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

f. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The evaluation herein is the same as under Checklist Item X.e. above.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				

a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c.	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s impacts on Population and Housing:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities).
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Population and Housing impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to induce substantial population growth in an area under Impact PH-1, and determined the following:

- The development of new or expanded transfer stations, processing facilities, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities 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, especially in comparison to the City’s population. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to induce substantial population growth.
- Although processing capacity is considered a key component of Solid Resource diversion infrastructure, as are truck base yards that support collection, Solid Resource diversion programs are not likely a driving factor in determining whether people (other than as a result of new jobs created) or businesses locate within the City. Therefore, additional processing capacity and truck base yards are not expected to indirectly induce substantial population growth. Consequently, the Proposed Project may result in a small increase in population from the modest number of jobs created; however, it is not expected to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	70	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not induce substantial population growth. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would result in minor additional construction job creation; however, the number is not expected to be substantial, and is not expected to induce substantial population growth. Therefore, no new growth impacts would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not induce substantial population growth, and would not result in additional growth-related impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the Program to displace substantial numbers of existing housing under Impact PH-2, and determined the following:

- Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan and generally preclude residences. It is unlikely that housing 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. If displacement of housing were to occur, implementation of mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2 would mitigate the adverse impacts to below a level of significance.
- 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. 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

The certified Program EIR determined that if residences are located on industrially or agriculturally zoned land that would be used to site facilities, displacement of housing could occur, and applied mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2 to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause such facilities to be located or relocated to areas with developed housing. In addition, the enclosure of facilities would merely enclose facility operations, and would not result in housing displacements beyond displacements that might occur by an unenclosed facility. No new significant impacts related to the displacement of housing would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	71	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in the displacement of housing and would not result in additional impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the Program to displace substantial numbers of people under Impact PH-2, and determined the following:

- Industrial areas and agricultural areas in the City are established in the General Plan and generally preclude residences. It is unlikely that residents would be displaced 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 that house residents, they could result in adverse impacts to existing housing from construction-related disturbances and site development. If displacement of residents were to occur, implementation of mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2 would mitigate the adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that if residences are located on industrially or agriculturally zoned land that would be used to site facilities, displacement of residents could occur, and applied mitigation measures PH-1 and PH-2 to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause such facilities to be located or relocated to areas with residential development. In addition, the enclosure of facilities would merely enclose facility operations, and would not result in additional displacement of residents beyond displacements that might occur by an unenclosed facility. No new significant impacts related to the displacement of residents would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in the displacement of residents and would not result in additional impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				

a.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
	i.) Fire protection?				X
	ii.) Police protection?				X
	iii.) Schools?				X
	iv.) Parks?				X
	v.) Other public facilities?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s impacts on Public Services:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities). Industrial areas are generally established in the applicable General Plan.
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Public Services impact evaluations below.

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

i.) Fire Protection

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities under Impact PS-1, and determined the following:

- 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. The ability of a fire department to respond

to potential fire calls will depend on the location of the new facilities in relation to a station, as well as staffing at that station. At this time, the specific location of future facilities has not been identified. Development projects within the City and other jurisdictions are required to pay development impact fees, a portion of which pays for the increased demand for fire protection services. Such fee payments would be required of future facilities that are constructed to go towards the acquisition of additional fire personnel and equipment. Payment of these fees, which would be required as part of the development of future facilities, would reduce potential impacts to fire protection services to a less than significant level. In addition, the modest increase in population that could result from the increase in employment (see Section 3.2.10, Population and Housing) would be minor and not create a need for additional fire protection facilities.

- Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in the need for or provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, or impacts associated with their alteration or construction. Once new processing facilities and base yards are proposed and their locations identified, they would be further evaluated in site-specific CEQA environmental documentation at that time.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would comply with applicable fire code requirements, and would not result in the need for new or expanded fire protection facilities that could result in significant environmental impacts. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would undergo code compliance reviews at the local level as part of the permitting and entitlement process, and are not expected to result in the need for new or expanded fire protection facilities that could result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no new impacts related to fire facilities would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in the need for new or expanded fire protection facilities that would in turn result in significant environmental impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

ii.) Police Protection

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities under Impact PS-2, and determined the following:

- 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 (further separation of distinct streams of recyclable materials from Comingled Recyclables and separation of Organics) and base yards (collection vehicle storage and support) are not expected to substantively increase demand for police services or the need for new or expanded police protection facilities. In addition, the modest increase in population that could result from the increase in employment (see Section 3.2.10, Population and Housing) would be minor and not create a need for additional police protection facilities. Development projects within the City and other jurisdictions are required to pay development impact fees, a portion of which pays for the increased demand for police protection services. Such fee payments would be required of future facilities that are constructed to go towards the acquisition of additional police protection

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	74	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

personnel and equipment. Payment of these fees, which would be required as part of the development of future facilities, would reduce potential impacts to police protection services to a less than significant level.

- Once new processing facilities and base yards are proposed and their locations identified, they would be further evaluated in site-specific CEQA environmental documentation at that time.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would occur within existing established police service areas, and would pay required development impact fees which help to pay for increased demand for police protection services, and as a consequence, would not result in the need for new or expanded police protection facilities that could result in significant environmental impacts. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not affect facility processing activities and would therefore not result in the need for new or expanded police protection facilities that could in turn result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no new impacts related to police facilities would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in the need for new or expanded police protection facilities that could in turn result in significant environmental impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

iii) Schools

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities under Impact PS-3, and determined the following:

- At the time a new facility is proposed, the developer will be required to pay school fees appropriate for commercial or industrial development. The developer will be responsible for the fee rate in effect at the time the building permit is obtained. Other school districts have similar fee structures. Should the facilities be built outside the City, the developer would pay applicable fees to the appropriate school district. These fees will provide for additional educational facilities and resources. Pursuant to Government Code Sections 65995(h) and 65996(b) (SB 50), the payment of statutorily capped fee amounts provides “full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act... on the provision of adequate school facilities.” The modest increase in population that could result from the increase in employment (see Section 3.2.10, Population and Housing) would be minor and not create a need for additional school facilities. Therefore, new processing capacity and slight increase in employment under the Proposed Project would not require the need for or the provision of new or physically altered schools. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in the need for or the provision of new or physically altered schools, or impacts associated with their alteration or construction.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would pay applicable school fees via the building permit process, which would ensure that their share of adequate school facilities are provided. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	75	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house facilities' activities and would therefore not increase demand for schools that could require construction of new school facilities. Therefore, no new impacts related to school facilities would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in the need for new or expanded school facilities that could in turn result in significant environmental impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

iv) Parks

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program's potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered park facilities under Impact PS-4, and determined the following:

- Development of new and expanded facilities is not anticipated to result in any park development or increased population that could significantly affect park facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in or require the provision of new or physically altered park facilities, or impacts associated with their alteration or construction.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not result in increased demand for parks that could require the provision of new or physically altered park facilities, and associated impacts. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be "fully enclosed" to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house facilities' activities and would therefore not increase demand for parks such that construction of new or altered park facilities is required. Therefore, no new impacts related to park facilities would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in the need for new or expanded park facilities that could in turn result in significant environmental impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

v) Other Public Facilities

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program's potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public facilities under Impact PS-5, and determined the following:

- The new processing capacity and base yards 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. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in or require the provision of new or physically altered public facilities, or impacts associated with their alteration or construction.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not result in increased demand for public services that could require the provision of new or physically altered public facilities, and associated impacts. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be "fully enclosed" to the maximum extent practicable.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	76	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house facilities' activities and would therefore not increase demand for public facilities such that construction of new or altered park facilities is required. Therefore, no new impacts related to public facilities would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in the need for new or expanded public facilities that could in turn result in significant environmental impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION.	Would the project:				
a.	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program's impacts on Recreation:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities).
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in Recreation impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program's potential to increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical

deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated under Impact REC-1, and determined the following:

- 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, and Organics processing facilities 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that demand for recreation is linked to residential uses, rather than industrial activities such as the new facilities and expansion of existing facilities. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house the facilities’ activities and would therefore not increase the use of recreation and park facilities. Therefore, no new impacts related to recreation and park facilities would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in the enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in substantial physical deterioration of or impacts to parks from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the Program to adversely affect recreational facilities under Impact REC-2, and determined the following:

- 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.
- 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, truck base yards, or Organics processing facilities 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. If impacts to recreational facilities were to occur, implementation of mitigation measure REC-1 would mitigate the adverse impacts to below a level of significance.
- Under mitigation measure REC-1, replacement recreation facilities shall be acquired or constructed in the general vicinity prior to demolition of existing recreational facilities,

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	78	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR determined that if new facilities and expansion of existing facilities are located on or near recreational facilities, they could be affected by construction or displacement, and applied mitigation measure REC-1 to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause such facilities to be located or relocated to recreational areas or in close proximity to such areas. The FCP does not contain a recreational element and would not otherwise require the construction of recreational facilities. No new significant impacts related to the recreational facilities would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in additional significant impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				X
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c.	Result in a change in marine vessel traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X

d.	Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Discussion:

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s impacts on Transportation and Traffic:

- 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 (due to the industrial nature of the facilities).
- Organics processing facilities could also be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Transportation and Traffic impact evaluations below.

a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the Program to Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system under Impact TR-1, and determined the following:

- 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. Mitigation measure TR-1 is proposed to minimize potential traffic impacts to the extent possible.

The certified Program EIR determined that trips associated with new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in significant localized impacts to the road network, even with mitigation measure TR-1. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not cause trips associated with such facilities to shift to other parts of the transportation network.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	80	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

Further, the required facility enclosures are not trip generators and would not result in impacts to the transportation network. Therefore, the FCP would not conflict with traffic management plans. No new significant impacts related to conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in additional significant impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

The evaluation under herein is the same as under Checklist Item XVI.a. above.

c. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in a change in air traffic patterns that could result in substantial safety risks under Impact TR-3, and determined the following:

- 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that no impact related to changes in air traffic pattern and associated safety risks would result from the proposed Project. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house the facilities’ activities and would therefore not increase or affect any air traffic patterns or use. Therefore, no new impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns would occur from the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in changes in air traffic patterns and associated safety risks from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

d. Would the project substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to substantially increase hazards because of a design feature under Impact TR-4, and determined the following:

- 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

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	81	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

hazards due to incompatible uses. Impacts from future facilities are considered less than significant.

The certified Program EIR determined new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not substantially increase traffic hazards due to design features. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house the facilities’ activities and would not occur within designated transportation system rights of way. Therefore, the FCP would not result in design features that could result in traffic hazards, and no new impacts related traffic hazards would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in traffic hazards from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

e. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

The evaluation under herein is the same as under Checklist Item XVI.d. above.

f. Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation under Impact TR-6, and determined the following:

- 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.

The certified Program EIR determined new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not result in conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation due to compliance with permit processing requirements. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house the facilities’ activities and would not occur within designated transportation system rights of way or otherwise interfere with alternative modes of transportation or their infrastructure. Therefore, the FCP would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and no new impacts on alternative transportation would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	82	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.	Would the project:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board?				X
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?				X
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
h.	Require new (off-site) energy supply facilities or not incorporate energy conservation measures into facility design or operations.			X	

Discussion:

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	83	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The certified Program EIR determined the following about new facilities and expansion of existing facilities while evaluating the Program’s impacts on Utilities and Service Systems:

- Future new or expanded processing facilities, 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), which are generally served by existing water infrastructure and sewer systems that convey wastewater to one or more wastewater treatment or water reclamation plants that serve the City and the surrounding areas.
- Organics processing facilities could be sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses, depending on the processing technology utilized.

Other specific determinations from the certified Program EIR area are summarized below in the Utilities and Service Systems impact evaluations below.

a. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board under Impact UT-1, and determined the following:

- 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. New or expanded facilities and truck base yards would generate small amounts of wastewater associated with washroom and possibly shower facilities. Wastewater could also be generated from processing and general maintenance activities, but such wastewater would be subject to pretreatment under industrial waste discharge requirements. Based on this, 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 exceedances 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 in exceedances of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB that issues the effluent discharge permits for City wastewater treatment and water reclamation plants.

The certified Program EIR determined new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would not result in exceedances of the wastewater treatment requirements due to compliance with pretreatment requirements, and because facility wastewater discharges would be consistent with wastewater generated within existing wastewater treatment service areas. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house the facilities’ activities and would not require process changes that could cause wastewater from the facilities to exceed wastewater treatment standards. Therefore, the FCP would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board, and no new

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	84	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in exceedances of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

b. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the potential for the Program to require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities that could result in significant environmental impacts under Impact UT-2, and determined the following:

- 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. New or expanded facilities and truck base yards would generate small amounts of wastewater associated with washroom and possibly shower facilities. Although small amounts of wastewater would be generated by new processing capacity and truck base yards, there is currently adequate wastewater treatment capacity within the City's treatment plant service areas to accommodate wastewater flows. In addition, the City has developed a wastewater facilities plan to ensure that adequate treatment capacity is available (City of Los Angeles, 2006). 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. Projection of water supply capacity is typically determined based on population growth and is generally consistent with the applicable general plan. 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. Implementation of mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.
- 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that if new facilities and expansion of existing facilities are located outside of the City, they could require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects, and applied mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2 to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	85	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP does not include elements that would consume water or generate wastewater, and therefore would not result in the need for new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. No new significant impacts related to the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in the need to construct additional or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities that could result in significant impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities that could result in significant environmental impacts under Impact UT-3, and determined the following:

- Although the new or expanded facilities and truck base yards would result in the placement of new or modified impervious surfaces upon future sites zoned for industrial use or agriculture, stormwater retention BMPs incorporated into the future facilities, as required by the local permitting agencies would minimize potential effects upon the local storm drain systems in the City. 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, truck base yards, and Organics processing facilities could contribute to runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Therefore, the Proposed Project could require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Implementation of mitigation measures WQ-4, WQ-5, and WQ-6 described in the Hydrology-Water Quality section would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that runoff from new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could contribute to runoff flows that exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, and applied mitigation measures WQ-4, WQ-5, and WQ-6 to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities and therefore would not require the relocation of facilities to an area where downstream storm drain capacity is constrained. Enclosing facilities under the FCP is not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, as the enclosures would merely need to house designated work areas and would likely be located within setback areas or perimeter buffer zones. Therefore, the FCP would not substantively increase the amount of site runoff and would not result in the need to construct additional stormwater drainage infrastructure. No new significant impacts from the FCP would occur that could require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	86	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in or require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

d. Would sufficient water supplies be available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

The certified Program EIR evaluated whether sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Program from existing entitlements and resources, or whether new or expanded entitlements are needed under Impact UT-4, and determined the following:

- Facilities sited on lands zoned for agricultural uses could require use of alternative water systems such as groundwater wells due the lack of nearby potable water conveyance. Although the expanded or new processing facilities and truck base yards would result in some water demand associated with washroom and shower facilities, the amount would be small because processing is not water intensive. In addition, 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, water demand would be determined based on the individual jurisdiction, and each water purveyor is required to prepare a UWMP every 5 years. Projection of water supply capacity is typically determined based on population growth and is generally consistent with the applicable general plan. 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 be located in an area that would result in the need to secure new water supplies. Implementation of mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2 would mitigate the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance.

The certified Program EIR determined that if new facilities and expansion of existing facilities are located outside of the City, they could be located in an area that requires securing of new water supplies, and applied mitigation measures UT-1 and UT-2 to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The FCP does not contain elements that would consume substantive amount of water or generate wastewater, and therefore would not result in the need for new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. No new significant impacts related to the need to secure new water supplies would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in impacts associated with a need to secure new water supplies from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

e. Has the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

The evaluation under herein is the same as under Checklist Item XVII.b. above.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	87	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

f. Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to affect landfill capacity under Impact UT-6, and determined the following:

- These processing facilities would accept source-separated materials from Solid Resources generated, and further process the materials into commodities for subsequent marketing and reuse. Although residual wastes would remain at the processing facilities that would be disposed of at landfills, the residual wastes would be a fraction of the source-separated materials (from within the City) diverted from landfills. The net result of the collection of commingled Recyclables and source-separated Organics would be to divert a significant portion of existing Solid Resources tonnage away from landfill disposal to be recycled or reused. Currently, approximately 161,000 tons of commingled Recyclable and Organics are collected annually from Commercial Establishments and diverted from landfills.
- Under the Proposed Project, the amount of commingled Recyclable and Organics collected annually from Commercial Establishments and diverted from landfills would increase to over 1.5 million tons annually (approximately 4,200 tons per day) by 2030. 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.

The certified Program EIR determined that the Program would not result in significant impacts to solid waste capacity because it would divert a substantial amount of solid wastes generated in the City from landfills. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house the facilities’ activities and would not generate solid waste. Therefore, the enclosures would not reduce landfill capacity, and no new impacts would occur under the FCP that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in impacts related to a reduction in landfill capacity from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

g. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste under Impact UT-7, and determined the following:

- The Proposed Project would result in the diversion of materials (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

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	88	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

expanded processing capacity and truck base yards under the Proposed Project would not conflict with statutes or regulations related to Solid Resources.

The certified Program EIR determined that the Program would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste and that no impacts would occur. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures of new and existing facilities under the FCP would simply house the facility activities and would not generate solid waste. The FCP is a supporting certification program that is intended to ensure that facilities comply with recycLA goals and objectives, including compliance with applicable solid waste laws and regulations. Therefore, the FCP would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and no impacts would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would facilitate compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste, and would not result in impacts related to noncompliance with solid waste regulations from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

h. Would the project require new (off-site) energy supply facilities or not incorporate energy conservation measures into facility design or operations?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to require new (off-site) energy supply facilities or incorporate energy conservation measures into facility design under Impact UT-8, and determined the following:

- New or expanded materials processing facilities, transfer stations, and truck base yards would utilize energy for facility operations. However, the new or expanded facilities are not expected to result in intensive energy demands. In addition, the City currently has the energy capacity for future facilities; however, incorporating design features that would reduce consumption of energy into future building plans would reduce the demand for power. These “sustainability features” may include the use of energy efficient lighting and machinery. Alternative energy sources would also reduce electrical consumption from LADWP. With the incorporation of energy conserving measures specified in Mitigation Measure UT-3, a less than significant impact is identified. In addition to mitigation, compliance with Title 24 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The certified Program EIR determined that for new facilities and expansion of existing facilities, the incorporation of energy conserving measures specified in mitigation measure UT-3 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure LU-2 was included in the Program EIR, which required that future facilities would be “fully enclosed” to the maximum extent practicable.

The enclosures for new and existing facilities under the FCP would not be energy consumers. The facility enclosures could require the placement of interior lighting and air circulation systems, which would likely utilize electrical power; however, the enclosures would be subject to code compliance, including California Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Therefore, the FCP is not expected to result in substantial energy consumption or require new energy supplies. No new significant energy impacts would occur that were not examined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	89	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

The FCP would result in enclosure of facilities and represents technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in energy impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	90	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

		Impact relative to the certified Program EIR determinations			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Discussion:

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in impacts to Biological Resources (summarized in the discussions under Checklist Item IV. Biological Resources above) and Cultural Resources (summarized in the discussions under Checklist Item V. above), applied mitigation, and determined that impacts from new facilities and expanded facilities on Biological Resources would be less than significant, and that impacts on Cultural Resources

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	91	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

would be less than significant for archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains, but that potential impacts on historic resources would remain significant.

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities. Although enclosing facilities would have the effect of completely housing preprocessing, processing and/or transfer activities for organic materials (Green Bin), municipal solid wastes (Black Bin), and commingled recyclables (Blue Bin), they are not expected to substantively increase facility foot prints, and therefore, would not substantively reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal species.

The certified Program EIR determined that new facilities and expansion of existing facilities could result in unavoidable significant impacts on historic resources after mitigation (because there is a potential for historic structures to be damaged or demolished). The FCP would not change the location of facilities, and therefore, would not directly result in damage to historic properties. In addition, the enclosure of existing facilities is unlikely to adversely affect historic resources the enclosures would merely house facility operations and are not expected to result in footprint expansions that could extend to and damage historic resources offsite, if any. Therefore, the FCP is not expected to result in the elimination of important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

The certified Program EIR evaluated the Program’s potential to result in cumulative impacts across all the environmental resource areas, applied mitigation at the project level, and determined that the new facilities and expansion of existing facilities would ****NOT** make cumulative considerable contributions to significant cumulative impacts to all resource areas, except for the following:

- Air Quality,
- Historic Resources,
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and
- Transportation and Traffic.

The FCP would not result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts from those discussed in the certified Program EIR, as discussed in the Written Checklist items discussed above. The FCP would not require locations changes of facilities, would not result in substantive facility footprint expansions that could adversely affect environmental resources, and would require enclosures that house and shield facility activities. The FCP and its enclosure elements represent technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR. Therefore, the enclosures are not expected to make additional cumulative considerable contributions to significant cumulative impacts in any of the resource areas from those determined in the certified Program EIR.

c. Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	92	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

The FCP would not change the location of new or existing facilities; rather, it would require enclosures that house and shield facility activities, which could be beneficial relative to an open air facility. In addition, the enclosure of facilities would not result in new significant impacts in resource areas that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans, such as air quality and noise. The FCP and its enclosure elements represent minor technical changes and potential minor expansions of use that would not result in additional significant impacts from those determined in the certified Program EIR. Therefore, the FCP would not cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

INCORPORATION OF FEASIBLE MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPED IN THE PROGRAM EIR

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(3) and consistent with the CEQA Guidelines 15168(c)(4) checklist analysis above, the City will incorporate the mitigation measures adopted with the certification of the Program EIR on April 15, 2014, as set forth in the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), into the FCP. (See Appendix B for the complete MMRP).

In addition, the City will re-adopt the CEQA Findings for the Program EIR, adopted on April 15, 2014, as set forth in Appendix C, which includes a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC). The CEQA Findings found that the project alternatives were infeasible and that a SOC was necessary for the impacts that remained significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

LIST OF PREPARERS FOR ADDENDUM 2

Preparer

Louis Utsumi
Envicraft LLC

EDUCATION

B.Sc., Biological Sciences, University of California, Irvine, 1987

EXPERIENCE

Berth 226-236 [Everport] Container Terminal Project (EIR/EIS), Port of Los Angeles. 2018
Supported preparation of the EIS/EIR for the Berths 226-236 Container Terminal Project. This project is an expansion of the existing 205 acre terminal to 229 acres to accommodate an increase in container throughput from 1.24 million Twenty-foot Equivalent Units (TEUs) to 2.38 million TEUs by the year 2038.

City-Wide Exclusive Franchise System for Municipal Solid Waste Collection and Handling, City of Los Angeles. 2014. Supported preparation of the Program Environmental Impact Report for the City's program to establish a franchise system for commercial municipal solid waste collection and diversion. To meet the City's goal of 90% diversion by 2025, the City

recyclA – Facility Certification Program	93	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

proposed to convert the open permit solid waste collection system to a franchise program with specific diversion requirements and goal. The franchise system would establish 11 collection zones, select one hauler per zone, establish diversion goals for recyclables, green wastes, and organics, and implement an ordinance governing the program and participants. The Program EIR was certified in early 2014.

Master Facilities Plan (MFP)– Clearwater Program, County of Los Angeles. 2012. Provided technical guidance for the impact evaluations of the tunneling alternatives for the MFP Program and Project EIR. The various tunnel alternatives included an on land portion that portion extended from the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant in Carson and off shore portions that extended to the Pacific Ocean. Key methodology issues addressed included potential tunnel-related settlement, ground borne noise and vibration, and air quality.

Integrated Resources Plan Program and Project (EIR), City of Los Angeles. 2010-2013. Supported preparation of the Addendum for the IRP for the modifications to the Glendale Burbank Interceptor Sewer, and the Addendum for alignment and shaft site changes for the Northeast Interceptor Sewer Phase II

Integrated Resources Plan Program and Project (EIR), City of Los Angeles. 2006. Supported preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (both Program and Project Level) for the Integrated Resources Plan (IRP), which is a wastewater facilities plan that integrates the future recycled water and runoff management needs. The IRP involves upgrades to the City of Los Angeles’ wastewater, storm water, and recycled water infrastructure. The alternatives include expansion of the Hyperion Treatment Plant, Tillman Water Reclamation Plant, Los Angeles Glendale Water Reclamation Plant, three new major interceptor sewer tunnels (Northeast Interceptor Sewer Phase II, Glendale Burbank Interceptor Sewer, and Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer), expanded recycled water distribution system, and urban runoff management approaches.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	94	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

References

City of Los Angeles. 2013. (LASAN, 2013) Final Implementation for Exclusive Commercial and Multifamily Franchise Hauling System. Final Report. Prepared by Bureau of Sanitation, supported by CH2M HILL. April.

City of Los Angeles. 2014. Ordinance No. 182986. May 28 (effective date).

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2008. Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans. December 5.

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	95	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	---

This page left intentionally blank

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	96	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

**APPENDIX A:
Facility Certification Program**

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	97	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

This page left intentionally blank

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	98	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

APPENDIX B:
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	99	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	----	--

This page left intentionally blank

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	100	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	-----	--

APPENDIX C:
Statement of Overriding Considerations

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	101	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	-----	--

This page left intentionally blank

recycLA – Facility Certification Program	102	Addendum 2 and Written Checklist October 2018
--	-----	--