SECTION 1.0
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

1.1.1 PROJECT PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the Scholl Canyon Landfill (SCLF) Expansion (proposed project) is to provide waste diversion programs and disposal capacity to help meet the solid waste management needs of the City of Glendale (City) and other landfill users. The proposed project would allow for the continued disposal of non-hazardous municipal solid waste at the currently permitted daily tonnage levels of 3,400 tons per day. The proposed project would also include the continued recovery of materials such as green waste, asphalt, soil, tires, and metal appliances through ongoing landfill waste diversion programs on which several jurisdictions depend on to comply with state-mandated diversion goals. In addition, the proposed project would extend the recovery and beneficial use of landfill gas and thereby help meet California's renewable energy goals.

The specific objectives of the proposed project are to:

- Continue to provide a waste disposal option that has been proven to be environmentally sound and cost-effective at the currently permitted rate of 3,400 tons per day.
- Continue waste diversion programs that are critically important for landfill users to achieve state-mandated diversion requirements.
- Allow the City to maximize the use of a local resource for waste disposal, thus minimizing hauling distances and related environmental impacts.
- Allow for further development of disposal and diversion options, such as alternative technologies, for landfill users.

1.1.2 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PURPOSE

The purpose of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) is to inform decision-makers, public agencies and the general public about the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project. The DEIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with two variations of the proposed project. Variation 1 involves a vertical expansion of the landfill that would extend the landfill life by about 13 years[1]. Variation 2 involves a vertical and horizontal expansion that would extend landfill life by about 19 years[1]. The DEIR was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, *et seq*.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, §§ 15000, *et seq*.).

1.1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located in Los Angeles County at 3001 Scholl Canyon Road, Glendale, California, 91206. Regional access to the landfill is from the Ventura Freeway (State Route (SR) 134) at the Figueroa Street exit. Public access to the landfill is only from Scholl Canyon Road. The SCLF consists of a total of 535 acres, 440 acres of which are designated for landfill operations and 95 acres of which are designated for related operations (site access). The 440-acre operation area includes 314 acres of active area (Scholl Canyon) and 126 acres of inactive area (northern canyon).

[1] Assuming landfilling continues at the baseline disposal rate of 1,400 TPD. Unless noted otherwise, this assumption is used throughout this document when estimating years to closure.

1.1.4 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.4.1 Site History

The SCLF opened in 1961, and is owned by the City. The site is operated by the County Sanitation District No. 2 of Los Angeles County serving as the administrative entity for the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Sanitation Districts) pursuant to a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) between the City, County of Los Angeles (County), and Sanitation Districts. Landfilling operations were initially conducted in Scholl Canyon and subsequently moved to an adjacent canyon to the north. Near the end of the life of the northern canyon in 1975, landfilling operations resumed in the main Scholl Canyon. The northern canyon (which is not part of this project) is currently owned and maintained by the City and includes the Scholl Canyon Golf Course. Since 1975, landfilling operations have only been conducted in the main Scholl Canyon.

The landfill site occupies approximately 535 acres with 345 owned by the City, 60 acres owned by Los Angeles County and 25 acres owned by Southern California Edison (SCE). The area owned by Los Angeles County is not certified for landfill operations. The northern inactive portion of the site is approximately 126 acres. The active site is 314 acres, within which refuse has been landfilled on 239 acres and the balance consists of soil stockpiles, native areas, the scales facility, site operations facilities, and a debris basin.

SCE has ownership of a 25-acre parcel at SCLF on which it maintains power lines that transverse the landfill. In 1995, the Sanitation Districts (on behalf of the City) began working with SCE to pursue raising the power lines to allow for refuse placement up to an elevation of 1,475 feet within the SCE right-of-way. The power lines were raised in the year 2000 and the Sanitation Districts entered in to a temporary entry agreement with SCE that allowed for refuse placement within the SCE right-of-way until December 31, 2005. The Sanitation Districts also entered into a license agreement with SCE in 1999 that allowed for vehicular access through the SCE right-of-way until November 30, 2014.

During the mid-1980s, the amount of waste received at the SCLF increased significantly. In response, the City passed two ordinances on October 6, 1987. Ordinance No. 4780 limited use of the site to a wasteshed comprised of the following cities and communities: Glendale, La Canada-Flintridge, Pasadena, San Marino, Sierra Madre, South Pasadena, and the unincorporated Los Angeles County communities of Altadena, La Crescenta, Montrose, and East Pasadena. Ordinance No. 4781 limited the waste received for disposal to 33,600 tons per week (5,600 tons per day), Monday through Saturday. However, the current permit limits disposal to only 20,400 tons per week.

The SCLF is a Class III solid waste facility. All Class III solid waste facilities are required to have a Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) issued by the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) with concurrence by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), previously the Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). The SCLF is currently operating under SWFP No. 19-AA-0012 issued by the LEA (County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health (LADPH)) on May 17, 2002. The SWFP is reviewed by CalRecycle and LADPH every five years. The last five-year review process was concluded in December 2009. The SWFP for the SCLF permits the site to receive a maximum of 3,400 tons per day (TPD) for disposal, based on a six-day week. At the time the Notice of Preparation for this effort was issued, approximately 1,400 TPD of solid waste were disposed at the site (baseline tonnage).

The gross capacity for the site (including the northern canyon) is approximately 33.3 million tons. Through December 2010, approximately 28.5 million tons of refuse had been disposed in the SCLF. Of

this quantity, 4.5 million tons were placed in the northern canyon before it became inactive in 1975, and the remaining 24.0 million tons were disposed in the main Scholl Canyon.

The remaining fully permitted capacity of the SCLF (as of December 2010) was approximately 4.8 million tons. Fill is being placed in accordance with a final fill plan which has a maximum elevation of 1,525 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) and an average top deck elevation of approximately 1,500 feet AMSL. At the baseline tonnage of 1,400 TPD, the site would reach its currently permitted capacity in the year 2021.

1.1.4.2 Landfill Operations

The SCLF SWFP allows the site to be open to the public for disposal of refuse and other permitted materials from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., six days a week (Monday through Saturday), with the exception of certain holidays. The normal operating hours typically extend from 6:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M. Operations staff begins activities such as equipment maintenance and preparation, and road cleaning prior to opening the facility for public access. After the site closes to the public, cover placement is completed, equipment maintenance is performed and activities necessary to secure the site for the evening are completed. Operation of the site may extend outside of the normal operating hours when unusual circumstances or emergency situations arise.

Wastes disposed at the SCLF are limited to nonhazardous solid wastes and inert wastes not prohibited from disposal. According to 27 CCR §20220(a), nonhazardous solid waste means all putrescible[2] and non-putrescible solid, semi-solid, and liquid wastes including garbage, trash, refuse, paper, rubbish, ashes, industrial wastes, demolition and construction wastes, abandoned vehicles and parts thereof, discarded home and industrial appliances, manure, vegetable or animal solid and semi-solid wastes, and other discarded solid or semisolid wastes. Pursuant to 27 CCR §20230(a), inert waste does not contain hazardous waste or soluble pollutants at concentrations in excess of applicable water quality objectives, and does not contain significant quantities of decomposable waste.

The SCLF does not accept untreated medical waste, liquid waste, designated wastes (as defined by §13174 of the California Water Code), or hazardous wastes (as defined by Section 1004 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act). Measures are taken to prevent the accidental or illicit disposal of hazardous material at the landfill. The SCLF also does not accept radioactive wastes, as defined by the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA). Refer to Section 3.3.5 (Landfilling Operations) for definitions.

Wastes that require special handling include damaged goods or legally seized material requiring immediate disposal in the presence of insurance or U.S. Customs Officials. Disposal of certain manufactured material and edible products in the presence of health officials also requires special waste handling. Typically, such wastes are placed in a cavity at the base of the working face and covered immediately. Current Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) allow incinerator ash disposal provided the ash does not contain hazardous waste constituents or soluble pollutants at concentrations in excess of applicable water quality objectives.

1.1.4.3 Projected Waste Management Needs for Los Angeles County

Under its current SWFP and at the baseline tonnage of 1,400 TPD, the SCLF is projected to close by the end of 2021 at which time disposal alternatives would be required for the City and other regular users of

[2] Putrescible waste is waste material with high moisture content and a sufficient ratio of carbon to nitrogen to allow the anaerobic bacteria to convert it biologically.

the landfill. If the rate of disposal were to increase to the currently permitted maximum of 3,400 TPD, the SCLF could reach capacity as soon as 2015. Currently, there are only four other operating landfills within Los Angeles County that are available to jurisdictions within the SCLF wasteshed (Antelope Valley, Chiquita Canyon, Lancaster, and Sunshine Canyon). The Puente Hills Landfill closed for the receipt of refuse on October 31, 2013 and has increased the demand on these remaining landfills. Future in-county disposal options will therefore be very limited.

1.1.5 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Two design variations have been identified for the proposed project[3]: a vertical expansion only (Variation 1), and a vertical and horizontal expansion (Variation 2). Under both variations, the currently permitted tonnage of 3,400 tons per day (TPD) of non-hazardous solid waste would not change, and the current programs and operational practices described in Section 3.0 (Existing Facilities and Operations) of the DEIR would continue including incremental construction to expand the landfill gas control system, stormwater drainage system, and irrigation system. Both variations would increase the currently permitted capacity of 17.9 million cubic yards and landfilling would continue until all capacity is exhausted, regardless of fluctuations in daily disposal tonnages. Under both variations, the height of the SCLF would be increased from its current permitted level of 1,525 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) to about 1,705 feet AMSL.

A number of City (the Lead Agency) discretionary approvals would be required as part of the proposed project's approval and implementation. These include:

- Project Approval
- Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report
- Conditional Use Permit
- Amend the Scholl Canyon Joint Powers Agreement (JPA)
- Industrial Wastewater Discharge Permit

1.1.5.1 Variation 1

Variation 1 would provide approximately 11.5 million cubic yards (or 5.5 million tons) of additional capacity, which would extend the landfill's life by approximately 13 years. Variation 1 would also involve reconstructing the existing debris basin north of the fill area as a permanent facility.

1.1.5.2 Variation 2

Variation 2 would provide approximately 16.5 million cubic yards (or 8.0 million tons) of additional capacity, which would extend the landfill's life by 19 years. Variation 2 includes a 13-acre horizontal expansion to the north of the existing refuse footprint but within the existing permitted area of the landfill. To comply with regulations, a liner system and liquids collection system would be constructed in this area. To provide space for the expansion and re-routing of a major drainage flow line, the hill within the expansion area would be excavated. Variation 2 would also involve reconstructing the existing debris basin north of the fill area with a permanent facility that is deeper to accommodate the rerouted drainage flow line.

This DEIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with both variations to the same level of detail.

[3] Proposed project refers to both variations (Variation 1 and Variation 2).

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

1.2.1 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

In accordance with Sections 15063 and 15082 of CEQA Guidelines, the Sanitation Districts, acting on behalf of the Lead Agency, prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the DEIR. There were no known areas of controversy at the time the NOP was prepared.

1.2.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

1.2.2.1 Threshold of Significance

The threshold of significance for a given environmental effect is the level at which the Lead Agency finds an effect of the proposed project to be significant. A threshold of significance can be defined as a "quantitative or qualitative standard or set of criteria, pursuant to which significance of a given environmental effect may be determined" (CEQA Guidelines). The thresholds of significance provided in the CEQA Guidelines have been used as the basis of the environmental impact analysis for the DEIR.

1.2.2.2 Mitigation Measures

The DEIR considers feasible mitigation measures to reduce a significant environmental impact to a less than significant level. To reduce significant effects, mitigation measures must avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for a given impact. After the DEIR is certified, a mitigation monitoring program would be adopted to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully implemented.

1.2.2.3 Initial Study

The potential environmental effects from the project were initially analyzed with an Initial Study in accordance with Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Based on the Initial Study (included in Appendix A), it was determined that the project may have a potentially significant effect on the following environmental issue areas, which are individually addressed in Sections 6.1 through 6.11:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils and Hydrogeology
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Surface Water Hydrology
- Water Quality
- Noise
- Transportation and Traffic

1.2.2.4 Environmental Impacts Associated with the Project

The following paragraphs summarize the potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project (Variations 1 and 2).

Aesthetics
Implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to visual character/quality and would not result in a significant adverse impact to scenic vistas. However, implementation of the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts related to lighting.

Specifically, relocation of the equipment yard has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts if the relocated lighting spills over onto adjacent sensitive residential and wildlife habitat areas. A mitigation measure has been added to reduce the potential impact to below a level of significance.

Air Quality

Implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and objectionable odors. However, implementation of the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts related to conflict with or obstruction of implementation of an applicable air quality plan, violation of or contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, and a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment.

Specifically, operation of Variation 1 would result in the generation of criteria pollutants that would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) mass daily thresholds and localized significance thresholds for NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Additionally, because Variation 1 would result in PM_{10} emissions in excess of the SCAQMD's localized significance threshold, this impact could potentially conflict with the SCAQMD's attainment goals for 8-hour ozone and PM_{10}, as set forth in the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Even with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, emissions of NOx, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would not be reduced below a level of significance. Therefore, operation of Variation 1 would result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to air quality.

Construction and operation of Variation 2 would result in the generation of criteria pollutants that would exceed the SCAQMD mass daily thresholds and localized significance thresholds for NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Additionally, because Variation 2 would result in PM_{10} emissions in excess of the SCAQMD's localized significance threshold, this impact could potentially conflict with the SCAQMD's attainment goals for 8-hour ozone and PM_{10}, as set forth in the AQMP. Even with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, emissions of NOx, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would not be reduced below a level of significance. Therefore, construction and operation of Variation 2 would result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to air quality.

Biological Resources

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to special-status plants and vegetation communities or special-status wildlife species. Additionally, Variation 1 would not result in disturbance of any previously undisturbed vegetation. Therefore, Variation 1 would not result in significant adverse impacts related to wildlife species, wildlife movement corridors, or tree protection ordinances.

Variation 2 would result in the removal of 6.7 acres of previously undisturbed chaparral vegetation which is within the 9-acre hillside cut area. Following this analysis, it was determined that Variation 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to wildlife movement corridors and tree protection ordinances. However, implementation of Variation 2 has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts related to nesting habitat for some bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. A mitigation measure has been added to reduce the potential impact to below a level of significance.

Cultural Resources

Variation 1 would not disturb any native/intact soils. Therefore, Variation 1 would not result in significant adverse impacts related to cultural resources (archaeological resources or human remains).

Approximately 9 acres of hillside would be cut to accommodate the horizontal landfill expansion associated with Variation 2. Based on the results of an archaeological records search and field survey, there is a low probability of encountering cultural materials under Variation 2. Therefore, Variation 2

would not result in significant adverse impacts related to cultural resources (archaeological resources or human remains). Nonetheless, mitigation measures were developed to address the unlikely event in which archaeological resources or human remains are discovered during implementation of Variation 2.

Geology, Soils, and Hydrogeology
Implementation of Variation 1 would result in a less than significant impacts related to seismicity, liquefaction and unstable soils, slope stability, soil erosion and loss of topsoil.

Implementation of Variation 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to seismicity, liquefaction and unstable soils, soil erosion and loss of topsoil. However, Variation 2 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to stability of the foundation and slope of the proposed cut slopes. Mitigation measures have been added to reduce the potential impact to below a level of significance.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions
Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to conflicts with any applicable plan, policy, regulations, or requirement adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to the generation of greenhouse gas emissions.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to exposure of people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Surface Water Hydrology
Implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to alteration of the existing drainage pattern in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation or flooding, insufficient capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, additional sources of polluted runoff, or the need for new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. Specifically, existing structures have the capacity to accommodate the peak flows under both variations of the proposed project for a 100-year, 24-hour design storm. In addition, the proposed project would have a beneficial impact to both water quality and peak flow compared to existing conditions due to greater flow attenuation and desiltation.

Water Quality
Implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to a violation of surface water quality standards, groundwater quality standards, or waste discharge requirements. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact related to the degradation of water quality.

Specifically, all construction would conform to applicable best management practices (BMPs) in the existing Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the site, and materials to contain and remove leaked materials would continue to be maintained on site with a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan and SWPPP. Similarly, landfill operations would follow existing practices including compliance with the existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, SWPPP, soil acceptance program (SAP) and runoff monitoring program. Additionally, implementation of Variation 2 would include the construction of a liner system and liquids collection system to prevent migration of landfill liquids and landfill gas from the new fill area.

Noise
Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Implementation of the proposed project would result

in less than significant impacts related to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standard. The implementation of the proposed project would also result in less than significant impacts related to temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. However, implementation of the proposed project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts related to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Specifically, residences near Scholl Canyon Road between SR-134 and the Eagle Rock Substation could be significantly impacted by landfill related traffic noise if tonnage exceeds 2,600 tons per day (TPD). A mitigation measure has been added to reduce the potential impact to below a level of significance.

Transportation and Traffic

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to conflicts with an applicable congestion management program. However, when combined with forecasted population growth within the region, implementation of the proposed project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts related to conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Specifically, degradation in the level of service at the intersections of Figueroa Street at SR-134 westbound ramps and Figueroa Street at SR-134 eastbound ramps would occur. Mitigation measures have been added to reduce these potential impacts to below a level of significance.

1.3 ALTERNATIVES

1.3.1 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

Section 15126.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant effects of the proposed project. "Feasible" is defined as capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time taking into consideration economic, environmental, social and technological factors. A variety of alternatives for meeting the project objectives (refer to Section 1.1.1 Project Purpose and Objectives) was considered. All but one (Maximum Vertical and Horizontal Expansion Alternative) were deemed infeasible because of their inability to meet project objectives. There were no alternatives that would reduce the unavoidable significant impacts of the proposed project and still meet project objectives. The impacts of the feasible alternative are described in this DEIR along with the No Project Alternative as required by CEQA. A brief description of these two alternatives is provided below. For a detailed description, refer to Section 11.0 (Project Alternatives) of the DEIR.

1.3.1.1 No Project Alternative (Use of Existing Regional and Distant Landfills)

The No Project Alternative is defined as not approving an expansion of the SCLF. Under the No Project Alternative, SCLF would continue operating under the existing permits and the remaining permitted capacity would be exhausted in 2021 assuming waste disposal at 1,400 TPD. At that time, the landfill site would no longer accept waste and would undergo formal closure.

After SCLF closure, waste would continue to be generated. The City and other landfill users would have to identify another location or locations for disposal of waste and processing of diversion materials. Unless new facilities are sited and constructed, waste would need to be hauled via truck and/or train to more distant existing disposal facilities in Los Angeles and other counties. This alternative would require longer waste hauls, which would result in higher costs for current users of the SCLF and increased traffic, noise, and air quality impacts. Table 1-1 shows various facilities and their distances from SCLF.

TABLE 1-1. LANDFILLS IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION

Facility	Location	Approximate Roadway Distance from SCLF (miles)
Sunshine Canyon	Sylmar	24
Chiquita Canyon	Castaic	38
Olinda-Alpha	Brea	40
El Sobrante	Corona	58
Antelope Valley	Palmdale	60
Lancaster	Lancaster	75
Mesquite Regional	Imperial County	223

Source: Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County.

1.3.1.2 Maximum Vertical and Horizontal Expansion Alternative

This alternative would include a vertical expansion and a larger horizontal expansion than Variation 2. The currently permitted tonnage of 3,400 TPD of municipal solid waste (MSW) would not change and the current programs and operational practices described in Section 3.0 (Existing Facilities and Operations) would continue including incremental construction to expand the landfill gas control system, stormwater drainage system, and irrigation system. The Maximum Vertical and Horizontal Expansion Alternative would increase the permitted capacity by approximately 33.0 million cubic yards (or 16 million tons), which would extend the landfill's life by approximately 37 years assuming a waste disposal rate of 1,400 TPD. The height of the SCLF would be increased from its currently permitted elevation of 1,525 feet AMSL to about 1,705 feet AMSL. To maximize the volume of the expansion, this alternative would fill the gap between the existing north-facing landfill slopes and the south-facing native slopes to the north including excavation of the hillside mentioned for Variation 2. Such filling would require flows in the existing northern flow line to be diverted into a new tunnel through the ridgeline, and improvements to an existing channel and debris basin on the other side of the ridge. The lateral expansion area would require a liner and liquids collection system to comply with regulations. Expansion of the refuse footprint would be contained within the existing permitted area of the landfill.

1.3.2 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an EIR identify the environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative (*CEQA Guidelines* §15126.6(e)(2)). The No Project Alternative would avoid construction related to the Variation 2 horizontal expansion, but would result in the site's closure in the near future (2021 assuming the baseline tonnage of 1,400 TPD), which is much earlier than Variations 1 and 2. Upon closure, the waste generated by the City and other landfill users would need to be sent to an alternate disposal facility. Such an alternate is likely to be an existing, more distant facility that increases the waste haul distance relative to current hauls to the SCLF. As a result, the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in greater impacts related to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise and traffic than Variations 1 and 2. Further, the No Project Alternative would only do a fair job of meeting each of the four project objectives.

The Maximum Vertical and Horizontal Expansion Alternative would have similar but greater impacts than Variation 1 and Variation 2 in the short term due to the greater amount of construction required and larger area of disturbance. In the long term, this alternative would have a greater aesthetic impact once the fill elevation exceeds those of Variation 1 and Variation 2. However, other impacts such as those related to air quality, greenhouse gases, noise, and traffic would be less than those of Variation 1 and 2

based on the longer life expectancy of this alternative and the deferred need to haul waste a longer distance to another facility. Overall, this alternative was deemed environmentally inferior to the proposed project because the long-term impacts are only slightly superior to the proposed project while the short-term impacts are inferior.

In the short term, Variation 1 is slightly superior to Variation 2 due to the reduced biological, cultural and hydrologic impacts associated with the Variation 2 horizontal expansion. In the long term, Variation 1 is likely to result in higher air quality, greenhouse gas, noise, and traffic impacts since waste would need an alternative disposal option sooner. However, since the capacity for Variation 1 would not be exhausted until about 2034, the long-term impact in this comparison was given less weight than the biological, cultural and hydrologic impacts associated with Variation 2, and Variation 1 is therefore considered the environmentally superior alternative.

1.4 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Section 6.0 (Resource Specific Analysis) of the DEIR documents the technical analyses of the potential impacts of the proposed project related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils/hydrogeology, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, surface water hydrology, water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic. The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to these environmental parameters is summarized in Table 1-2.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Aesthetics		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would result in a less than significant impact related to visual character/quality.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Implementation of Variation 1 would not result in a significant adverse impact to scenic vistas.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Implementation of Variation 1 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to lighting.	AS-1 All lighting associated with the landfill shall be non-intrusive to adjacent and surrounding land uses.	Less than significant.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would result in a less than significant impact related to visual character/quality.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Implementation of Variation 2 would not result in a significant adverse impact to scenic vistas.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Implementation of Variation 2 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to lighting.	AS-1 All lighting associated with the landfill shall be non-intrusive to adjacent and surrounding land uses.	Less than significant.
Air Quality		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to conflict with or obstruction of implementation of an applicable air quality plan, violation of or contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, and a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment.	AQ-1 Cover customer haul roads to the working deck[4] with asphalt, crushed asphalt or equivalent material. AQ-2 Limit vehicle speeds to 15 mph on unpaved roads and 25 mph on paved roads. AQ-3 Require all trucks hauling material that have the potential to create dust, such as soil and certain building demolition materials, to be	Significant and Unavoidable.

[4] The working deck is the deck or lift containing the working face where refuse is currently being unloaded and landfilled.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	covered. AQ-4 Provide and maintain rumble strips to minimize soil carry-out. AQ-5 Where practicable, limit the areas of excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time. AQ-6 Stabilize materials that have high potential to create dust, such as large piles of soil by applying sufficient water prior to and after handling. AQ-7 Apply additional dust control measures during strong wind events. AQ-8 Post a sign at the site entrance with a phone number that the public can call for information and to log a complaint. Provide a system to respond to such calls including logging of all complaints. AQ-9 Where practicable, co-locate green waste grinding and soil import operations near to the working face to minimize haul distances and operating time for heavy equipment. AQ-10 To the extent practicable, minimize use of on site diesel equipment, particularly unnecessary idling. AQ-11 All construction equipment will be properly maintained and the engines tuned to the engine manufacturer's specifications. AQ-12 Prohibit construction equipment from idling longer than 5 minutes by posting signs within construction equipment operator compartments and providing awareness training to operators regarding idling limits. AQ-13 Use on site electricity rather than temporary power generators in portions of the facility where electricity is available.	

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Implementation of Variation 1 would result in less than significant impacts related to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and objectionable odors.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to conflict with or obstruction of implementation of an applicable air quality plan, violation of or contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, and a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment.	AQ-1 through AQ-13 from above.	Significant and Unavoidable.
Implementation of Variation 2 would result in a less than significant impacts related to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and objectionable odors.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Biological Resources		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would not result in significant adverse impacts related to special-status plants and vegetation communities, special-status wildlife species, other wildlife species, wildlife movement corridors, or tree protection ordinances.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would not result in significant adverse impacts related to special-status plants and vegetation communities or special-status wildlife species.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Implementation of Variation 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to wildlife movement	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
corridors and tree protection ordinances.		
Implementation of Variation 2 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to the removal of potential nesting habitat for some bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.	BR-1 If disturbance of previously undisturbed vegetation in the horizontal expansion cut area cannot be avoided during the breeding bird season (generally March 1 through August 1), the Sanitation Districts will conduct pre-construction breeding-bird surveys of the area to be disturbed including a 300-foot buffer around the area to be disturbed. The surveys shall be completed by a qualified biologist. For disturbance outside of nesting season, such surveys are not required. If no nesting birds are observed, the land disturbance may commence. If an active nest is located, the nest shall be marked a minimum of 100 feet (for non-raptors, 300 feet for raptors) in all directions and this area shall not be disturbed until after July 31 or until the nest becomes inactive. Buffers less than those proposed here are subject to CDFW approval in consultation with the project biologist. If a threatened or endangered species is located within the survey area, the Sanitation Districts will consult with USFWS and/or CDFW on appropriate actions.	Less than significant.
Cultural Resources		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would not result in significant adverse impacts related to cultural resources (archaeological resources or human remains).	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would not result in significant adverse impacts related to cultural resources (archaeological resources or human remains). Although Variation 2 would not result in significant adverse impacts related to archaeological resources or human remains, the following mitigation measures were developed to	CR-1 In the event that archaeological resources are found during clearing or excavation within the native areas, such activity shall cease and the Sanitation Districts shall consult a qualified archaeologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, the Sanitation Districts and the qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist would meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a	No impact.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
address the unlikely event in which archaeological resources or human remains are discovered during implementation of Variation 2.	report prepared by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards. CR-2 In the event that human remains are found, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. The County Coroner shall make such a determination within two working days of notification of the discovery. The County Coroner shall be notified within 24 hours of the discovery. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are or are believed to be Native American, the County Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendents shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the County Construction Engineer, the treatment and disposition of the human remains.	
Geology, Soils and Hydrogeology		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would result in less than significant impacts related to seismicity, liquefaction and unstable soils, slope stability, and soil erosion and loss of topsoil.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to seismicity, liquefaction and unstable soils, and soil erosion and loss of topsoil.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Implementation of Variation 2 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to stability of the foundation and slope of the proposed cut slopes.	G-1 Prior to construction of the landfill liner as part of Variation 2, soft, yielding material will be replaced with compacted, proof-rolled fill. Any fill placed beneath sections of the landfill to be lined should be compacted to 90% relative compaction per ASTM D 1557. G-2 Stockpiled soils shall be excavated down to competent native material before liner construction. G-3 During excavation of the cut slopes as part of Variation 2, a certified engineering geologist shall perform in-grading observation and mapping of the cut slope excavation to ensure that any potential adversely-oriented discontinuities, or other potential stability issues, are identified and mitigated, if necessary. G-4 To prevent erosion or excessive groundwater infiltration, brow drains, or other methods, shall be installed to prevent concentrated flows onto newly cut slopes.	Less than significant.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would result in a less than significant impact related to the generation of greenhouse gas emissions.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Implementation of Variation 1 would not result in a significant adverse impact related to conflicts with any applicable plan, policy, regulations, or requirement adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would result in a less than significant impact related to the generation of greenhouse gas emissions.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Implementation of Variation 2 would not result in a significant adverse impact related to conflicts with any applicable plan, policy, regulations, or requirement adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would not result in a significant adverse impact related to exposure of people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would not result in a significant adverse impact related to exposure of people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Surface Water Hydrology		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would result in less than significant impacts related to alteration of the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation or flooding, insufficient capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, additional sources of polluted runoff, or the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to alteration of the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
result in substantial erosion or siltation or flooding, insufficient capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, additional sources of polluted runoff, or the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.		
Water Quality		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would result in less than significant impacts related to a violation of surface water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and groundwater quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Implementation of Variation 1 would not result in a significant adverse impacts related to a degradation of water quality.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to a violation of surface water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and groundwater quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Implementation of Variation 2 would not result in a significant adverse impact related to a degradation of water quality.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Noise		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would result in less than significant impacts related to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standard and	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.		
Implementation of Variation 1 would not result in a significant adverse impact related to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Implementation of Variation 1 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.	N-1 When the landfill tonnage reaches 2,600 TPD, the Sanitation Districts shall conduct an acoustical analysis to determine the noise exposure level along Scholl Canyon Road, between SR-134 and the Eagle Rock Substation at residential locations west of Scholl Canyon Road to determine if, and where, the outdoor noise standard of 65 dBA CNEL is being exceeded. The locations considered should, at a minimum, be the residences within 129 feet of the centerline at Scholl Canyon Road. At that time, a site-specific acoustical analysis will be prepared to identify impacted areas, determine the source of the impact, and provide mitigation for those impacts associated with the proposed project, as necessary. The mitigation may take the form of noise barriers, structural upgrades, traffic controls or similar measures. The noise reduction recommendations will be coordinated with the City of Glendale.	Less than significant.
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standard and temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Implementation of Variation 2 would not result in a significant adverse impact related to groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Implementation of Variation 2 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.	N-1 When the landfill tonnage reaches 2,600 TPD, the Sanitation Districts shall conduct an acoustical analysis to determine the noise exposure level along Scholl Canyon Road, between SR-134 and the Eagle Rock Substation at residential locations west of Scholl Canyon Road to determine if, and where, the outdoor noise standard of 65 dBA CNEL is being exceeded. The locations considered should, at a minimum, be the residences within 129 feet of the centerline at Scholl Canyon Road. At that time, a site-specific acoustical analysis will be prepared to identify impacted areas, determine the source of the impact, and provide mitigation for those impacts associated with the proposed project, as necessary. The mitigation may take the form of noise barriers, structural upgrades, traffic controls or similar measures. The noise reduction recommendations will be coordinated with the City of Glendale.	Less than significant.
Transportation and Traffic		
Variation 1		
Implementation of Variation 1 would not result in a significant adverse impact related to conflicts with an applicable congestion management program.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Implementation of Variation 1 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	T-1 Figueroa Street at SR 134 westbound ramps. To mitigate the impacts associated with implementation of Variation 1 under the 2020 interim and 2034 horizon years, the following improvements would be needed, pursuant to Caltrans approval: stripe one southbound left-turn lane, signalize the intersection, provide a protected southbound left-turn phase, and provide protected northbound right-turn phase that is overlapped with the westbound approach phase. Assuming existing operations continue through 2020 and 2034 (resulting in a net increase of project trips above existing), the Sanitation Districts would be responsible for its fair-share contribution of 63 percent towards construction costs associated with those improvements.	Less than significant.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	T-2 Figueroa Street at SR 134 eastbound ramps. To mitigate the impacts associated with implementation of Variation 1 under the 2020 and 2034 horizon years, the following improvements would be needed, pursuant to Caltrans approval: in the northbound approach, restripe the existing painted median to provide an additional northbound through lane and convert the existing northbound shared-through right-turn lane into an exclusive right-turn only lane, resulting in two northbound through lanes and an exclusive right-turn lane. The existing painted median would be shifted approximately 9 feet west of its current alignment. In order to minimize the offset of the northbound receiving lanes, the entire southbound approach would need to be shifted approximately 10 feet to the west. Adequate width is provided on the southbound approach such that a southbound left and two southbound through lanes can be maintained with the 10 foot westward shift. The two southbound through lanes would merge into one southbound through past the SR-134 EB Ramps, similar to the current configuration. Assuming existing operations continue through 2020 and 2034 (resulting in a net increase of project trips above existing), the Sanitation Districts would be responsible for its fair-share contribution of 55 and 52 percent, respectively, towards construction costs associated with those improvements.	
Variation 2		
Implementation of Variation 2 would not result in a significant adverse impact related to conflicts with an applicable congestion management program.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Implementation of Variation 2 has the potential to result in significant impacts related to conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	T-3 <u>Figueroa Street at SR 134 westbound ramps.</u> To mitigate the impacts associated with implementation of Variation 2 under the 2020 interim and 2040 horizon years, the following improvements would be needed, pursuant to Caltrans approval: stripe one southbound left-turn lane, signalize the intersection, provide a	Less than significant.

TABLE 1-2. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	protected southbound left-turn phase, and provide protected northbound right-turn phase that is overlapped with the westbound approach phase. Assuming existing operations continue through 2020 and 2040 (resulting in a net increase of project trips above existing), the Sanitation Districts would be responsible for its fair-share contribution of 63 and 62 percent, respectively, towards construction costs associated with those improvements. T-4 Figueroa Street at SR 134 eastbound ramps. To mitigate the impacts associated with implementation of Variation 2 under the 2020 and 2040 horizon years, the following improvements would be needed, pursuant to Caltrans approval: in the northbound approach, restripe the existing painted median to provide an additional northbound through lane and convert the existing northbound shared-through right-turn lane into an exclusive right-turn only lane, resulting in two northbound through lanes and an exclusive right-turn lane. The existing painted median would be shifted approximately 9 feet west of its current alignment. In order to minimize the offset of the northbound receiving lanes, the entire southbound approach would need to be shifted approximately 10 feet to the west. Adequate width is provided on the southbound approach such that a southbound left and two southbound through lanes can be maintained with the 10 foot westward shift. The two southbound through lanes would merge into one southbound through past the SR-134 EB Ramps, similar to the current configuration. Assuming existing operations continue through 2020 and 2040 (resulting in a net increase of project trips above existing), the Sanitation Districts would be responsible for its fair-share contribution of 55 and 50 percent, respectively, towards construction costs associated with those improvements.	