



JENSEN SOLIDS HANDLING FACILITY PROJECT

Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations
and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
SCH No. 2009111081

Metropolitan Water District
of Southern California
Report No. 1359

November 2010





JENSEN SOLIDS HANDLING FACILITY PROJECT

Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations
and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
SCH No. 2009111081

Metropolitan Water District
of Southern California
Report No. 1359

November 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Jensen Solids Handling Facility Project Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction	1-1
1.1 Certification	1-1
1.2 Organization of CEQA Findings of Fact.....	1-2
1.3 Record of Proceedings.....	1-3
1.4 Findings Required Under CEQA.....	1-4
1.5 Project Level Analysis	1-5
1.6 Incorporation by Reference.....	1-5
1.7 Legal Effects of Findings.....	1-6
2. Project Description	2-1
2.1 Environmental Setting	2-1
2.2 Project Overview	2-2
2.3 Project Objectives	2-4
2.4 Discretionary Actions	2-5
3. CEQA Review and Public Outreach	3-1
4. Impacts Determined to be Less than Significant	4-1
4.1 Aesthetics.....	4-1
4.2 Air Quality.....	4-1
4.3 Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources.....	4-2
4.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	4-2
4.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	4-3
4.6 Hydrology and Water Quality	4-3
4.7 Noise and Vibration.....	4-3
4.8 Population, Employment, and Housing.....	4-4
4.9 Public Services and Utilities	4-4
4.10 Recreation	4-5
4.11 Traffic.....	4-5
4.12 Cumulative Impacts.....	4-5
5. Less-than-Significant Environmental Impacts with Mitigation	5-1
5.1 Biological Resources.....	5-1
5.2 Cultural Resources.....	5-3
5.3 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	5-6
5.4 Hydrology and Water Quality	5-8
5.5 Traffic and Circulation	5-10
5.6 Cumulative	5-11

	<u>Page</u>
6. Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts	6-1
6.1 Air Quality – Project Level	6-1
6.2 Noise	6-3
6.3 Air Quality - Cumulative	6-4
7. Project Alternatives	7-1
7.1 No Project Alternative	7-2
7.2 Alternative 2: Lagoons and Sewer Alternative	7-3
8. Statement of Overriding Considerations	8-1
8.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts	8-2
8.2 Project Benefits	8-3
8.3 Statement of Overriding Considerations	8-3
9. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	9-1
Table 1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	9-2

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resource Code Section 21080(d)) and the *State CEQA Guidelines* (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15063) evaluating potential environmental effects that may result from the proposed Jensen Solids Handling Facility Project. These Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations have been prepared for the project pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15091 and 15093.

1.1 Certification

In accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15090, Metropolitan, as Lead Agency for the project, certifies that:

- (a) The Final EIR for the project has been completed and processed in compliance with the requirements of CEQA;
- (b) The Final EIR was presented to the Metropolitan Board of Directors, and as the decision-making body for Metropolitan, the Board of Directors reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the project; and
- (c) The Final EIR reflects Metropolitan's independent judgment and analysis.

With the adoption of these findings, Metropolitan has exercised independent judgment in accordance with Public Resource Code (PRC) Section 21082.1(c) while retaining its own environmental consultant, i.e., directing the consultant in preparation of the entire EIR as well as reviewing, analyzing, and revising material prepared by the consultant.

These Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations have been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The purpose of these Findings of Fact is to satisfy the requirements of PRC Section 21081 and Sections 15090, 15091, 15092, 15093, 15094, and 15097 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, in connection with the approval of the Jensen Solids Handling Facility Project.

Before project approval, a Final EIR must be certified pursuant to Section 15090 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Additionally, Metropolitan must make one or more of the following findings in its Findings of Fact, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale, pursuant to PRC Section 21081 and Section 15091 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, for each identified potentially significant adverse impact:

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

Metropolitan has made one or more of the specific written findings above regarding each potentially significant impact associated with the project. Those findings are presented here, along with a presentation of facts in support of the findings. The proposed mitigation measures identified as feasible and within Metropolitan's authority to implement for the approved project become express conditions of approval that Metropolitan commits and binds itself to upon project approval. These requirements are referenced in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) adopted concurrently with these Findings of Fact and will become effective and implemented, as applicable, through project implementation (i.e, pre-construction, construction, post-construction, operation, and routine maintenance).

Section 15092 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* states that after consideration of an EIR, and in conjunction with the Section 15091 findings identified above, the Lead Agency may decide whether or how to approve or carry out the proposed project. The Lead Agency may approve a project with unavoidable significant adverse environmental effects only when it finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the proposed project outweigh those effects. Section 15093 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires the Lead Agency to document and substantiate any such determination in a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" as a part of the record.

Metropolitan's Statement of Overriding Considerations is presented in Chapter 8. As required by CEQA, Metropolitan expressly finds that the Final EIR for the Jensen Solids Handling Facility Project reflects Metropolitan's independent review and judgment. In accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Metropolitan adopts these Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations as part of its certification of the Final EIR. A brief explanation of the rationale for each finding is provided in Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7.

1.2 Organization of CEQA Findings of Fact

The content and format of these CEQA Findings of Fact are designed to meet the latest CEQA Statutes and Guidelines. This document is organized into the following sections:

Chapter 1, Introduction outlines the organization of this document and identifies the location and custodian of the record of proceedings.

Chapter 2, Project Description describes the location, project overview, project objectives, and the required permits and approvals for the project.

Chapter 3, CEQA Review and Public Outreach describes the steps Metropolitan has undertaken to comply with the *State CEQA Guidelines* as they relate to public input, review, and participation during the preparation of the Draft and Final EIR.

Chapter 4, Impacts Determined to be Less than Significant provides a summary of those environmental issue areas where no reasonably foreseeable impacts would occur and those impacts determined to be below the threshold of significance without the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Chapter 5, Less-than-Significant Environmental Impacts with Mitigation provides a summary of potentially significant environmental impacts for which implementation of proposed feasible mitigation measures would avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Chapter 6, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts provides a summary of potentially significant and significant environmental impacts for which no feasible mitigation measures are identified, or for which implementation of proposed feasible mitigation measures would not avoid or substantially reduce the environmental effects to less-than-significant levels. This section also provides specific written findings regarding each significant impact associated with the proposed project.

Chapter 7, Project Alternatives provides a summary of the alternatives considered for the proposed project.

Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations provides a summary of all of the project's significant unavoidable adverse impacts. In addition, this section identifies the project's substantial benefits that outweigh and override the project's significant unavoidable impacts, such that the impacts are considered acceptable.

Chapter 9, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program provides a brief discussion of the project's compliance with the *State CEQA Guidelines* regarding the adoption of a program for reporting and monitoring.

1.3 Record of Proceedings

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which Metropolitan project approval is based are located at the Metropolitan offices: 700 North Alameda Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. Metropolitan is the custodian of such documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings. The record of proceedings is provided in compliance with PRC Section 21081.6(a)(2) and Section 15091(e) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

1.4 Findings Required Under CEQA

Under CEQA, for each significant or potentially significant environmental impact identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three allowable conclusions. The first allowable finding is that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (*See State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091 (a)(1).) The second allowable finding is that “[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.” (*See State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(2).) The third allowable conclusion is that “[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.” (*See State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(3).)

CEQA requires that the Lead Agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to avoid or substantially reduce significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where they are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (*See State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(3)(c).) PRC Section 21061.1 defines the word “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15364 adds another factor: legal considerations. (*See also Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* [“Goleta II”] [1990] 52 Cal.3d 553, 565 [276 Cal. Rptr. 410].)

The *State CEQA Guidelines* do not define the difference between “avoiding” a significant environmental effect and merely “substantially lessening” such an effect. Metropolitan must therefore glean the meaning of these terms from the other contexts in which the terms are used. PRC Section 21081, on which *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091 is based, uses the term “mitigate” rather than “substantially lessen.” The *State CEQA Guidelines* therefore equate “mitigating” with “substantially lessening.” Such an understanding of the statutory term is consistent with the policies underlying CEQA, which include the policy that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects.” (Refer to PRC Section 21002.)

For purposes of these findings, the term “avoid” refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise potentially significant effect to a less-than-significant level. In contrast, the term “substantially lessen” refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a level that is less than significant. Although the *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is “avoid[ed] or substantially lessen[ed],” these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether

the effect in question has been reduced to a level that is less than significant, or has simply been substantially lessened but remains significant.

Moreover, although Section 15091, read literally, does not require findings to address environmental impacts that an EIR identifies as merely “potentially significant,” these findings will nevertheless fully account for all such impacts identified in the Final EIR. Only after fully complying with the findings requirement can an agency adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations. (*Citizens for Quality Growth v. City of Mount Shasta* (1988) 198 Cal.App.3d 433, 442, 445 [243 Cal. Rptr. 727].)

In cases in which significant impacts are not at least substantially mitigated, the agency, after adopting the findings, may approve the project if it first adopts a Statement of Overriding Considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project’s benefits rendered acceptable its unavoidable significant adverse environmental effects. (Refer to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15093, 15043(b).) The California Supreme Court has stated that, “[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (Refer to *Goleta II*, 52 Cal.3d 553, 576 [276 Cal.Rptr. 401].)

This document presents Metropolitan’s findings as required by CEQA, cites substantial evidence in the record in support of each of these findings, and presents an explanation to supply the logical step between the finding and the facts in the record. (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091.)

1.5 Project Level Analysis

The Final EIR for the proposed project provides an analysis of potential impacts of all construction, operational, and routine maintenance actions and activities reasonably foreseeable with implementation of the proposed project. In other words, the following project components are evaluated at a level of detail that is typically provided in a project EIR (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15161):

- Construction of a solids dewatering facility, lagoon system, and pipelines and minor facilities;
- Modification to existing dry polymer building; and
- Operation of solids dewatering facility and lagoons for handling of solids generated at the Jensen Plant.

1.6 Incorporation by Reference

The Final EIR is hereby incorporated by reference into these findings in its entirety including the Draft EIR. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of the proposed mitigation measures, the basis for determining the significance of potential

impacts, the comparative analysis of feasible alternatives, and the reasons for approving the proposed project in spite of the potential for associated significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

1.7 Legal Effects of Findings

To the extent that these findings conclude that the proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, Metropolitan hereby commits to implementing these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when Metropolitan adopts a resolution approving the proposed project.

The mitigation measures are referenced in the MMRP (Chapter 9.0 of this document) adopted concurrently with these findings, and will be effectuated, as applicable, through the process of implementing the proposed project (i.e., pre-construction, construction, post-construction, operation, and routine maintenance).

CHAPTER 2

Project Description

2.1 Environmental Setting

2.1.1 Existing Setting

The proposed project would construct a new solids dewatering facility and new solids drying lagoons in the southeastern portion of the Jensen Plant. This area is currently leased¹ to the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (LADRP) and is developed with ball fields used for local youth baseball and soccer. The site consists of five baseball diamonds with infield fences and small equipment buildings behind home plate, and four soccer fields. The ball fields are maintained by the LADRP. The lease will expire by January 1, 2011, at which time the lessee is obligated to remove all structures and improvements. However, since the Draft EIR was published, Metropolitan has entered into negotiations with LADRP to extend the lease for a maximum term of 18 months. Under the current schedule, the proposed project would not be constructed until after the proposed 18-month lease extension expires and the recreation improvements have been removed by the lessee. Construction activities do not include minor, pre-construction activities such as feasibility studies and investigations that may occur prior to removal of the ball field improvements. However, if the schedule changes for construction or for the lease expiration, Metropolitan will conduct any further CEQA analysis, as required at that time, to address new or different potential environmental impacts, if any. Since the facilities were present at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued, they and the lease are included in the baseline condition as required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15125.

2.1.2 Surrounding Land Uses

The proposed project would be located at 13100 Balboa Boulevard in the community of Granada Hills in the City of Los Angeles, California. The Jensen Plant is bordered by Balboa Boulevard on the west, Interstate 5 (I-5) and San Fernando Road on the north, the Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant (LAAFP) on the east, and single-family residential properties on the south. The proposed project would be constructed entirely within the existing Jensen Plant site (see Figure 2-2 of the Draft EIR).

¹ Referred to in Metropolitan's records as Revenue Lease No. 2300.

2.2 Project Overview

The proposed project would involve site preparation (i.e., excavation, soil stabilization, and site grading), relocation of existing facilities, and construction of new facilities. Therefore, the project would be constructed in two phases: (1) site preparation, and (2) facility construction.

Site Preparation

The proposed site preparation would include: (1) removing the top 24 inches of soil from the entire project site and potentially removing and/or relocating the incidental facilities, (2) stabilizing soil beneath the belt press building, and (3) excavating and grading for the proposed facilities and support infrastructure. The site preparation would take up to approximately 250 working days.

Belt Press Building Soil Stabilization Construction Characteristics

The proposed location of the belt press building would require site stabilization work due to underlying liquefiable soil. The groundwater is approximately 50 feet below the existing ground surface, and the depth of soil that needs to be stabilized is approximately 70 feet below the existing ground surface. Two practical soil stabilization options were selected; their respective schedules and crew size are described below.

Option 1 – Complete Over-excavation and Recompaction

Complete over-excavation and recompaction would involve excavating potentially liquefiable soils beneath the site. The footprint of this process would be approximately 230 feet wide by 280 feet long with an average depth of 70 feet (anticipated depth of excavation is approximately 55 feet at the western limit and 85 feet at the eastern limit). Approximately 270,000 cubic yards of material would be excavated from the site and stockpiled. The excavated soils would be stockpiled at the future Module No. 4 site and reused as fill material during the recompaction operation (see Figure 2-4 of the Draft EIR). An additional 25,000 cubic yards of soil would be imported to be mixed in with the excavated soil prior to being recompacted during soil stabilization. During this process, it is anticipated that construction dewatering would be needed at an average of approximately 100 gallons per minute to control subsurface water flow in the excavation area. Construction dewatering pump rates may be adjusted in order to adequately maintain a dry and stable excavation area.

The excavation can be accomplished in two ways: (1) shored excavation, or (2) temporary sloped excavation. The shored excavation would involve the installation of soldier piles consisting of steel I-beams or H-beams. Laggings (support framing) would be installed between the adjacent soldier piles, and additional lateral support would be provided by tiebacks (steel tendons used to laterally hold back the soldier pile walls for stability). The temporary sloped excavation would involve excavating the ground at a 1:1 slope.

Construction Schedule

Installation of the equipment and wells to control subsurface water inflows is estimated to take 25 working days (five weeks) with a crew size of about 10 people (one crew). The installation of

soldier piles and tiebacks for the shored excavation method is estimated to take less than 100 working days with a crew size of about 20 people (two crews). The shored excavation or the temporary sloped excavation is estimated to take less than 160 working days with a crew size of about 35 people (two crews). The construction duration for stabilizing the soils for the belt press building would be approximately 250 working days, which includes the overlapping of construction phases.

Option 2 – Deep Soil Mixing

Deep soil mixing is a ground reinforcement method that mechanically mixes the existing soils with cementitious materials injected into shafts drilled in the site. The shafts can be constructed using mixing paddles or a hollow stem auger with paddles. The shaft would be equipped with internal ports for injecting cementitious materials for soil mixing. All soil within the required ground improvement footprint would be soil-mixed with no dewatering needed. This option would require a temporary concrete batch plant, which would be located in the area of Module No. 4.

Construction Schedule

Deep soil mixing is estimated to take 220 working days with a total crew size of about 25 people (two crews). Each workday is anticipated to consist of two crews working in one 8-hour shift with two 8-hour shifts per day (16 hours total). This option would include a temporary concrete batch plant on-site to supply the cement slurry needed in deep soil mixing.

Solids Dewatering Facility Construction Characteristics

The proposed project would involve construction of (1) the solids dewatering facility, and (2) lagoons. The facility construction would take up to 360 working days. The solids dewatering facility and lagoon constructions would occur at the same time. The solids dewatering facility construction would involve (1) pouring concrete foundations for the belt press building, thickened solids equalization tanks, decant/filtrate pump station, solids cake storage area, truck loading area, and rainwater retention/percolation basins; (2) erecting walls and installing the roof of the belt press building, thickened solids equalization tanks, and decant/filtrate pump station; (3) constructing utility conduits and building access roads; (4) installing equipment; and (5) programming and testing equipment. The construction of lagoons would involve (1) underdrain and floor construction, (2) inlet, outlet, decant structure, and concrete slope lining construction, and (3) perimeter access road construction.

Existing Dry Polymer Building Modification

In addition to constructing new solids dewatering facility and lagoons, the existing dry polymer building would need to be modified to supply the polymer required at the new belt press building and for the new lagoons. The descriptions of such modifications are listed below.

- Replace an existing 650-gallon polymer mixing tank with a new 1,500-gallon tank;

- Replace an existing polymer transfer pump, which pumps the mixed polymer from the mixing tank to the storage tank in the dry polymer building, with a new pump with higher pumping capacity; and
- Replace two existing polymer transfer pumps, which will pump the polymer solution from the dry polymer building to the belt press building, with two new pumps with higher pumping capacity.

Pipelines and Other Minor Facilities

The following pipelines and other minor facilities would also be constructed in association with the proposed solids dewatering facility and lagoons:

- A pipeline (10 to 12 inches in diameter and approximately 4,000-foot long) to convey solids from the existing and new thickeners to the new solids dewatering facility and lagoons;
- A pipeline (12-inches in diameter and approximately 2,000-foot long) to convey filtrate from the belt presses and decant water as well as underdrainage flow from the lagoons to the WWRPs;
- A pipeline (8 inch in diameter and approximately 2,000-foot long) to convey lagoon decant and underdrainage flow from the lagoons to Decant/Filtrate Pump Station;
- New utilities (potable, fire protection and service water lines; sewer line; power, communications, security, and control systems ductbank; filtrate/decant/underdrain line, surface water drainage line);
- Miscellaneous new structures (underdrain lines for lagoons, surface water drainage lines);
- Relocation of existing utilities (sanitary sewer, storm drain, electrical conduit, and water lines); and
- Remove or properly abandon in place chlorine and sample lines and oil line.

2.2.1 Construction Activities

Construction activities for the proposed project would occur for approximately 28 months. Construction would begin between 2011 and 2012. Normal work hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. are envisioned, with Saturday hours of 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. However, if soil stabilization Option 2 is chosen, work hours would be from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. for an 11-month span in order to stabilize the soil for the belt press building. Metropolitan would obtain a noise permit from the City of Los Angeles to enable the contractor to work 16-hour workdays under Option 2.

2.3 Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project are as follows:

- Provide permanent facilities at the Jensen Plant with sufficient capacity to accommodate dewatering of solids generated from the water treatment process under design plant flow conditions (750 mgd);

- Replace temporary off-site capacity at the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) lagoons that will be lost on the expiration of the Metropolitan-LADWP agreement in 2014; and
- Reduce the need to discharge water treatment solids to the sanitary sewer.

2.4 Discretionary Actions

An EIR is a public document used by a public agency to analyze the potentially significant environmental effects of a proposed project, to identify feasible alternatives, and to disclose possible ways to substantially reduce or avoid such impacts to the physical environment (CCR, Title 14, Section 15121). As an informational document, an EIR does not recommend for or against approval of a project. The main purpose of an EIR is to inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential environmental impacts of a proposed project. This Final EIR will be used by Metropolitan, as the Lead Agency under CEQA, and Responsible Agencies in making decisions with regard to the construction and operation of the proposed project. Responsible Agencies having discretionary approval over components of the project include the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and the City of Los Angeles. Metropolitan and these Responsible Agencies would use the analysis contained within this Final EIR to support the following regulatory permits or approvals:

- California Department of Fish and Game: 1601 Permit
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board: Dewatering Permit, Waste Discharge Requirements, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
- City of Los Angeles: Noise Permit, Construction Permit

CHAPTER 3

CEQA Review and Public Outreach

Metropolitan has complied with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines* during the preparation of the EIR for the proposed project. In accordance with Section 15082 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a NOP was circulated to local, state, and federal agencies and to other interested parties in November 2009. Copies of the NOP were made available for local review at the Los Angeles County Clerk/Recorders Office and the Metropolitan web site: www.mwdh2o.com. The NOP was also submitted to the California Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse to solicit participation from state agencies in determining the scope of the EIR.

In response to the NOP, written comment letters were received from the following organizations: California Department of Transportation, Department of Toxic Substances Control, Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation, City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, Native American Heritage Commission, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and stakeholders in the Granada Hills and surrounding community. The comment letters are included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment in July 2010, initiating a 45-day public review period pursuant to CEQA and its implementing guidelines. The document and Notice of Completion (NOC) were distributed to the California Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse. Relevant agencies also received copies of the document. A Notice of Availability (NOA) was distributed to interested parties and adjacent property owners, residents and advertised in the local paper, which informed them of where they could view the document and how to comment. The purpose of the 45-day review period was to provide interested public agencies, groups and individuals the opportunity to comment on the contents and accuracy of the document.

During the public comment period, copies of the Draft EIR and technical appendices were made available for review at the Porter Ranch Library (11371 Tampa Avenue, Northridge, CA 91326), Granada Hills Branch Library (10640 Petit Avenue, Granada Hills, CA 91344), Sylmar Branch Library (14561 Polk Street, Sylmar, CA 91342), San Fernando Library (217 N. Maclay Avenue, San Fernando, CA 91340) and posted on Metropolitan's website at www.mwdh2o.com.

A Final EIR has been completed and includes a revised executive summary, written comments on the Draft EIR received by mail and electronic mail, written responses to the written comments, and errata to the Draft EIR.

CHAPTER 4

Impacts Determined to be Less than Significant

The following potential environmental impacts of the project are less than significant and therefore do not require mitigation measures.

4.1 Aesthetics

The proposed project would not substantially affect existing scenic views from any public viewing location or scenic vistas. Views of the proposed modification to the Jensen Plant would be limited from public access areas, and the new building would resemble the industrial character of the existing Jensen Plant facilities. The proposed lagoons would appear different than the existing fields currently in view from the hillside; however, they would not be visible from any public viewing location. Impacts on a scenic vista would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.1-10)

The proposed project is not located within an officially designated County scenic highway or eligible state scenic highway. Therefore, impacts to scenic resources within a state scenic highway or on the surrounding visual character would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.1-11)

Construction of the proposed project would alter but not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the Jensen Plant property. The overall visual character of the general area would not be significantly degraded as seen from surrounding views since these views are predominantly industrial in character. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.1-11)

The proposed project's lighting would be limited and comparable to the light generated by the surrounding uses at the Jensen Plant. Nighttime construction lighting, if needed, would be shielded and pointed away from surrounding light-sensitive land uses and directed toward the Jensen Plant. Further, the project would not include highly-reflective construction material and would therefore have a less-than-significant impact associated with light and glare. (Draft EIR p. 3.1-12)

4.2 Air Quality

Project operation would result in minimal emissions of criteria air pollutants. The project would generate a maximum of 25 new daily haul truck and chemical delivery truck trips during the operation of the Jensen Plant at full capacity (a typical day would generate substantially less than 25 truck trips). The operation of the proposed project would not exceed the South Coast Air

Quality Management District (SCAQMD) significance criteria and would therefore result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality. (Draft EIR 3.3-20)

The construction and operation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors. The proposed project would not add any additional equipment or processes that would emit adverse odors. The project would therefore have a less-than-significant impact to objectionable odors. (Draft EIR p. 3.3-21)

4.3 Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources

The proposed project site lies in a region that is seismically active and has experienced ground shaking and liquefaction-induced ground deformation in the past. The proposed facilities would be constructed in compliance with California Building Code (CBC) requirements. Construction methods would conform to the CBC standards and would ensure that impacts regarding liquefaction are reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR p. 3.6-11)

The proposed project would disturb more than one acre and, therefore, would require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity (General Construction Permit). In compliance with this discharge permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared. The SWPPP would outline best management practices (BMPs) intended to reduce erosion that could otherwise flow to nearby water bodies. As a result of compliance with the NPDES permit, the potential for erosion or loss of topsoil during construction would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.6-12)

Project designs would ensure compliance with CBC standards to prepare the site or otherwise stabilize unstable soils for the belt press building. Properly prepared site designs would reduce potential soil stability disturbances during construction of the proposed project to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR p. 3.6-13)

Geotechnical assessments of the site did not identify expansive soils in the proposed project area. However, project design would conform to the CBC standards, which would include removal of potentially unknown expansive soils. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.6-13)

4.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD draft screening threshold for industrial sources (10,000 metric tons per year CO₂e). Further, the proposed project would not conflict with the state goals in Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.7-14)

While the City of Los Angeles currently does not have a Climate Action Plan or similar plan implemented for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the proposed project would not

conflict with state goals in AB 32 or other applicable policies for reducing GHG emissions. The cumulative impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.7-15)

4.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Construction of the proposed project would temporarily increase the transportation of hazardous materials. However, quantities would be limited, and the materials would be transported in accordance with Caltrans requirements and disposed of in compliance with federal and state requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.8-9)

There are no schools identified within one-quarter mile of the project site. Van Gogh Elementary School is located just outside the one-quarter-mile radius from the project site. Nevertheless, construction of the proposed project would not result in a release of hazardous emissions, substances or waste that might impact any school site. Operation of the proposed project would not require transportation of hazardous materials that could impact schools within a one-quarter-mile radius. Therefore, impacts associated with hazardous emission or materials would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.8-11)

The proposed project would not be located on a known hazardous materials site and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.8-12)

4.6 Hydrology and Water Quality

The proposed project would not involve or result in any withdrawals of groundwater other than construction dewatering if soil stabilization Option 1 is chosen for the belt press building site. The solids dewatering facility would include rainwater retention/percolation basins that would detain storm water runoff from impervious surfaces. The slight reduction of percolation of storm water due to the removal of the existing ball fields would be minimal and would not lower the groundwater table. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.9-13)

The proposed project is not located in a flood hazard area as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project would include rainwater retention/percolation basins that would capture runoff and percolate it into the ground. There would not be an increase in runoff from the project site. The storm drain system would be sufficient to accommodate the runoff after the project is constructed, since runoff flows would be reduced from the current conditions. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.9-15)

4.7 Noise and Vibration

Operation of the proposed project facilities would not exceed ambient noise levels of 3-dBA Leq significance thresholds at the property line of the nearby sensitive receptors. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.11-15)

Use of heavy equipment during project construction would not create vibration levels at the nearest sensitive receptor or structures that would exceed the potential building damage threshold of 0.3 inches per second. Construction would result in a less-than-significant vibration impact (Draft EIR p. 3.11-16)

4.8 Population, Employment, and Housing

The proposed project does not include construction of new housing developments or businesses that would induce substantial population growth. The project would not remove an obstacle of growth such as supplying new infrastructure that would encourage growth. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.12-4)

4.9 Public Services and Utilities

Construction of the proposed project would include temporary truck and employee traffic along haul routes that could temporarily increase the potential for accidents to occur in these areas. This short-term increase in demand for additional police or fire service on an as-needed and emergency basis would be limited and could be accommodated with existing resources within the proposed project area. Impacts to fire and police protection services would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.13-8)

Ensuring the provision of adequate types and numbers of public recreational resources within a particular community in the city of Los Angeles is within the jurisdiction of LADRP, not Metropolitan, whose primary mission is water treatment and conveyance to its member agencies in southern California. Eventual relocation and replacement of the ball fields and incidental facilities will be required by LADRP as a result of the expiration of its lease with Metropolitan. It is not a required mitigation measure for Metropolitan as a consequence of the proposed project. Thus, the only potential physical impacts from the expiration of the lease would include removal of the incidental facilities. The impacts of this removal would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.13-8)

The proposed project would not change the overall drainage conditions at the Jensen Plant other than on the current ball fields. The proposed lagoons and rainwater retention basins south of the belt press building would capture runoff. The project would not require construction of a new storm water drainage facility or expansion of existing facilities to accommodate increased storm water flows. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.13-9)

The proposed project would involve the construction of a solids dewatering facility that would enable the Jensen Plant to process solids generated on-site at full water treatment capacity. The proposed project would reduce the need to direct solids to the sewer, and therefore impacts to capacity of the wastewater provider would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.13-9)

Waste and debris produced from construction of the proposed project would be disposed according to state and local mandates. Solid waste produced during the operation of the proposed

project would be taken to Sunshine Canyon Landfill or nursery and would not accelerate the anticipated landfill closure date. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.13-10)

Construction and operation of the proposed project would require electricity on-site that would be accommodated by an on-site substation. No upgrades to electrical facilities outside of the Jensen Plant would be required. As a result, impacts would be less than significant for electricity demand. (Draft EIR p. 3.13-11)

4.10 Recreation

Ensuring the provision of adequate types and numbers of public recreational resources within a particular community in the city of Los Angeles is within the jurisdiction of LADRP, not Metropolitan, whose primary mission is water treatment and conveyance to its member agencies in southern California. Eventual relocation and replacement of the ball fields and incidental facilities will be required by LADRP as a result of the expiration of its lease with Metropolitan. It is not a required mitigation measure for Metropolitan as a consequence of the proposed project. Thus, the only potential physical impacts from the expiration of the lease would include removal of the incidental facilities. The impacts of this removal would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.14-6)

4.11 Traffic

The proposed project would not be subject to Level of Service (LOS) standards established by the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) for designated roadways in the project area because LOS standards do not apply to construction projects. The proposed project's potential increase in daily vehicle trips would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.15-30)

The proposed project would not result in construction or modification of roadways within the existing off-site circulation system. The proposed project would be in conformance with local traffic safety requirements and therefore would not increase hazards. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.15-32)

The proposed project would not result in the modification of existing access points that could result in inadequate emergency access. All driveways and internal parking would be designed in conformance with city sight distance, queuing, and other applicable traffic safety requirements. Impacts to emergency access would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.15-32)

4.12 Cumulative Impacts

Concurrent construction of several projects in the vicinity of Jensen Plant could result in cumulative short-term impacts. However, as described in the following sections, no substantial cumulative impacts would occur for aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, air quality (for operational impacts), geology, soils and mineral resources, greenhouse gases, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use planning, noise and vibration,

population and housing, public services and utilities, recreation, and transportation and traffic. (Draft EIR p. 4-10)

Aesthetics

The proposed project would not impact visual resources surrounding the site. The project would result in no cumulative impacts as a result of concurrent construction within a visual line-of-sight range of another project.

Agricultural and Forest Resources

The proposed project, in conjunction with the list of related projects, would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on agricultural resources in the area.

Air Quality

Emissions generated during operation in concurrence with other project activities in the area would not contribute to regional cumulative air quality impacts and would be less than significant.

Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources

Geologic hazards are localized in nature, as they are related to the soils and geologic character of a particular site. Conformance with CBC requirements would minimize the contribution to cumulative geologic impacts.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed project's contribution to GHG emissions would not be considerable and would not contribute significantly to a global warming effect.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The proposed project's individual contribution to hazards is less than significant. The project would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As with the proposed project, all related projects are subject to the same federal Clean Water Act, State Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act, and local Water Quality Management Plan regulations that protect water quality and water resources. The proposed project's incremental contribution to water quality and quantity impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Land Use

Construction activities would be conducted within an existing public water facility and would be exempt from local planning and zoning regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively significant impacts to land uses.

Noise and Vibration

Operation of the proposed project would generally be a passive land use with lagoons for drying solids. The incremental noise level increase from the lagoon cleaning process would not exceed significant thresholds and would be considered a less-than-significant impact. The belt presses used during the solids dewatering process would be housed within a concrete structure and would be inaudible to nearby sensitive receptors. Further, the proposed project would not add any substantial vehicle trips to existing operations that would increase ambient noise levels to an unacceptable range. Mobile noise levels associated with project operation would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact in conjunction with related projects in the area.

Population, Employment, and Housing

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not increase the capacity of the Jensen Plant, induce population growth, or contribute to a need for new housing. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact.

Public Services and Utilities

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in a short-term or long-term increase in demand for public services or utilities.

Recreation

The proposed project does not include any components that would increase the number of residents or employees residing in the area that would impact parks and/or recreational facilities. The removal of existing ball fields is under the jurisdiction of LADRP. The proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts to recreation.

Transportation and Traffic

The proposed project would not substantially increase operational traffic. A limited number of trips would be generated for the disposal of solids and delivery of chemicals (25 trips a day). All future projects within the city would be required to comply with existing regulations and undergo environmental review to assure that impacts are evaluated and mitigated, as appropriate. The proposed project would not contribute significantly to future cumulative traffic levels. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

CHAPTER 5

Less-than-significant Environmental Impacts with Mitigation

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091, the following are the impacts of the proposed project for which mitigation measures have been proposed in the Draft EIR. These measures will avoid or substantially lessen the following potentially significant environmental impacts to a less-than-significant level:

5.1 Biological Resources

5.1.1 Project-Level Impacts

Impact 3.4-1: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.4-1 that construction activities associated with the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on nesting birds. (Draft EIR p. 3.4-8)

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Preconstruction Nest Survey. If project construction activities are undertaken between February 1 and August 31, a qualified biologist shall survey the project site no more than three days prior to commencement of disturbance and determine whether the proposed activities could disrupt the nesting of any listed migratory bird species under the MBTA. Disruption of nesting could be caused by the physical removal of an active nest, increased human activity near an active nest, loud noises, etc. If project construction cannot be initiated during this time period, site grubbing and grading during this time period can minimize the potential for bird nesting during the remainder of the construction period.

If an active nest is discovered, the monitor shall observe the birds' behaviors when construction activities commence to determine whether construction activity should be ceased by Metropolitan or altered by Metropolitan in the nest vicinity in order to avoid nest failure. If any areas need to be avoided, the limits of avoidance may be demarcated with flagging or fencing. Nesting birds that are observed within impact areas shall be avoided until all nestlings have fledged and nesting activities have been concluded.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

Significant

Not Significant

Finding(s) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or “substantially lessen” the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See *infra*, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: Construction activity may temporarily deter some birds and ground-dwelling wildlife from foraging, roosting, and/or nesting in the vicinity. However, due to the lack of suitable habitat and the site’s human disturbance within the existing ball fields, the proposed project would not cause any adverse effects to special-status species. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure that nesting migratory birds are avoided. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.4-1)

Impact 3.4-2: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.4-2 that the proposed project’s construction would create dust that could substantially affect riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. (Draft EIR p. 3.4-10)

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Water or a stabilizing agent shall be applied to exposed surfaces at least two times per day to prevent generation of dust plumes.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: The construction contractor shall utilize at least one of the following measures at each vehicle egress from the project site to a paved public road:

- Install a pad consisting of washed gravel maintained in clean condition to a depth of at least six inches and extending at least 30 feet wide and at least 50 feet long;
- Pave the surface extending at least 100 feet and at least 20 feet wide;
- Utilize a wheel shaker/wheel spreading device consisting of raised dividers at least 24 feet long and 10 feet wide to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages

Mitigation Measure AQ-3: All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions).

Mitigation Measure AQ-4: Heavy-duty equipment operations shall be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts.

Mitigation Measure AQ-5: Ground cover in disturbed areas shall be replaced as quickly as possible.

Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.

Mitigation Measure AQ-7: Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil is carried onto adjacent public paved roads.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or “substantially lessen” the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See infra, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: Construction of the project would create dust generated by vehicles and construction equipment. Vegetation in the project vicinity, including riparian vegetation along Bull Creek, could be affected. Implementing Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-7 from Section 3.3 Air Quality would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. (Draft EIR p. 3.4-10)

5.2 Cultural Resources

5.2.1 Project-Level Impacts

Impact 3.5-1: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.5-1 that project construction could adversely affect known or unknown cultural resources. (Draft EIR p. 3.5-11)

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Monitoring by a qualified archaeologist during ground disturbing activities. A qualified archaeologist shall be retained to monitor during construction-related excavation activities within native alluvial materials. The duration and timing of monitoring shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with Metropolitan and based on the grading plans. In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work must be halted in the vicinity of the discovery until the qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the resources, and if necessary, have such resources recovered.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Avoidance of cultural resources. Prior to construction, Metropolitan shall prepare or have a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP) and/or Treatment Plan (TP) prepared, per *State CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4, to outline the appropriate action needed to recover the cultural materials in a professional manner. The CRMMP/TP shall establish the criteria utilized to evaluate the historic significance (per CEQA) of the unanticipated discoveries of unknown archaeological resources identified during construction activities, as well as identify the appropriate data recovery methods and procedures to mitigate the effect of the project upon those resources determined historically significant. If prehistoric or historic sites are encountered during construction-related earth-moving activities, the CRMMP/TP shall address the recovery, analysis, laboratory procedures, and final Report of Findings requirements that are necessary to meet the CEQA, and all state, city, and local regulations.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or “substantially lessen” the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See *infra*, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: Construction of the proposed project could result in disturbance to cultural resources. Archival research and literature review revealed that sites and historic structures were located within a two-mile radius of the project property. Construction could inadvertently disturb, damage or destroy previously unknown buried archaeological resources during excavation activities within the native alluvial deposits. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would ensure that impacts to archaeological resources are reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR p. 3.5-12)

Impact 3.5-2: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.5-2 that the project could adversely affect paleontological resources. (Draft EIR p. 3.5-12)

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during ground disturbing activities. A qualified paleontologist shall be retained to monitor during construction-related excavation activities in native deposits. The duration and timing of

monitoring shall be determined by the paleontologist in consultation with Metropolitan and based on the construction-related excavation activities.

Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Accidental discovery of paleontological resources. If paleontological resources such as fossil remains or fossiliferous sediment are encountered during the course of construction and monitoring, ground-disturbing activities shall be directed away from the vicinity of the find so that the paleontologist can evaluate the resources and recover them as appropriate. The paleontologist shall collect the material and record stratigraphic cross sections as well as map/graph pertinent geologic units. Fossils must be cleaned, analyzed and catalogued in order to be accessioned for curation at an appropriate repository. A final report shall be prepared that discusses any findings of paleontological resources.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or “substantially lessen” the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See infra, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: Significant fossil vertebrate remains may be encountered during construction and excavation activities within the older Quaternary Alluvial deposits and the rock unit of the Saugus Formation. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-3 and CUL-4 would ensure that any impacts to paleontological resources from construction of the proposed project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during construction-related excavation, and following proper procedures if any fossils are encountered, will ensure that impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR p. 3.5-12)

Impact 3.5-3: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.5-3 that the project could result in the disturbance of human remains. (Draft EIR p. 3.5-12)

Mitigation Measure CUL-5: Halt Work if Human Skeletal Remains are Identified During Construction. If human skeletal remains are encountered during the course of construction activities, Metropolitan shall immediately halt all construction activities and contact the Los Angeles County coroner in order to evaluate the skeletal remains, as well as

comply with the regulatory requirements of Section 15064.5 (e)(1) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. If it is determined the skeletal remains are Native American, Metropolitan shall consult with the NAHC, pursuant to the Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 (c), and Public Resource Code 5097.98 (as amended by AB 2641). Public Resource Code 5097.8 provides that the landowner will ensure that the Native American remains, and the immediate vicinity, are protected from damage or further construction disturbances until consultation between Metropolitan and the Most Likely Descendant has transpired, resulting in a determination regarding the handling of the uncovered remains and any future unanticipated human remains discoveries in the immediate vicinity.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or “substantially lessen” the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See *infra*, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: The high level of prehistoric activity in the project area may suggest that burials and/or habitation sites could be present within a one-mile radius of the project site. Construction and excavation activities may uncover or inadvertently damage human remains, which could be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-5 would ensure that any impacts to encountered human remains would be less than significant and that proper procedures to temporarily halt construction are taken. (Draft EIR p. 3.5-14)

5.3 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

5.3.1 Project-Level Impacts

Impact 3.8-2: The Final EIR concludes that the proposed project could increase the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials during construction. This may increase the risk of exposure to the public or environment. (Draft EIR p. 3.8-10)

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Metropolitan shall require the construction contractor(s) to implement BMPs for handling hazardous materials during construction of the project. The use of the construction BMPs shall minimize negative effects on groundwater and soils, workers, and the public, and will include the following:

- Follow manufacturers' recommendations and regulatory requirements for use, storage, and disposal of chemical products and hazardous materials used in construction.
- During routine maintenance of construction equipment, properly contain and remove used grease and oils.
- Properly dispose of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Metropolitan shall require the construction contractor(s) to implement safety measures in accordance with General Industry Safety Orders for Spill and Overflow Control (CCR Title 8, Sections 5163-5167) to protect the project area from contamination due to accidental release of hazardous materials. The safety measures shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Hazardous materials shall be stored in containers that are chemically inert to and appropriate for the type and quantity of the hazardous substance.
- Containers shall not be stored where they are exposed to heat sufficient enough to rupture the containers or cause leakage.
- Specific information shall be provided regarding safe procedures and other precautions before cleaning or subsequent use or disposal of hazardous materials containers.

Disposal of all hazardous materials shall be in compliance with applicable California hazardous waste disposal laws. The construction contractor(s) shall contact the local fire agency and the Los Angeles City Fire Department, for any site-specific requirements regarding hazardous materials or hazardous waste containment or handling.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: In the event of an accidental release of hazardous materials during construction, containment and clean up shall occur in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: Oil and other solvents used during maintenance of construction equipment shall be recycled or disposed of in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. All hazardous materials shall be transported, handled, and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-5: Metropolitan shall require the construction contractor(s) to prepare and implement a Safety Program to ensure the health and safety of construction workers and the public during project construction. The Safety Program shall include an injury and illness prevention program, a site-specific safety plan, and information on the appropriate personal protective equipment to be used during construction.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or "substantially lessen" the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See infra, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: Construction of the proposed project would require equipment utilizing hazardous materials that could accidentally be spilled or otherwise released into the environment. This exposure to construction workers, the public and/or the environment is a potential hazardous condition. Project operations would not require the use of any hazardous materials and therefore would not have significant exposure impacts. With implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-5, project impacts would be reduced to less than significant. (Draft EIR p. 3.8-10)

5.4 Hydrology and Water Quality

5.4.1 Project-Level Impacts

Impact 3.9-1: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.9-1 that construction and operation of the proposed project could potentially violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. (Draft EIR p. 3.9-11)

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1: Metropolitan shall require its construction contractor(s) to prepare and submit a SWPPP in accordance with the California General Permit 2009-009-SWQ, that identifies specific actions and BMPs to prevent storm water pollution during construction activities.

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2: If groundwater dewatering is required for construction and the groundwater cannot be pumped to the WWRPs, Metropolitan's construction contractor(s) shall obtain the required NPDES discharge permit from the Los Angeles RWQCB - WDRs for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Board Order No. R4-2008-0032, General NPDES Permit No. CAG994004).

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or "substantially lessen" the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See infra, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: The proposed construction activities could result in a potentially significant impact to the water quality of Bull Creek and the Los Angeles River due to soil erosion and the subsequent discharge of sediment to downgradient surface waters or drainages. BMPs to control these impacts will be implemented to ensure that water quality would not be impaired. The proposed project's effect on local groundwater would be minor; however, improperly discharged water could result in turbidity in Bull Creek. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1 and HYDRO-2 would ensure that construction storm water runoff would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and that dewatering activities would not result in excessive turbidity. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR p. 3.9-13)

Impact 3.9-3: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.9-3 that construction of the proposed project could result in potential soil erosion and the subsequent discharge of sediment to downgradient surface waters or drainages. (Draft EIR p. 3.9-14)

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1: Metropolitan shall require its construction contractor(s) to prepare and submit a SWPPP in accordance with the California General Permit 2009-009-SWQ, that identifies specific actions and BMPs to prevent storm water pollution during construction activities.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or "substantially lessen" the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See infra, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: The construction of the project would involve earthmoving activities that could discharge sediment to downgradient surface waters or result in substantial erosion. The NPDES General Construction Permit and SWPPP would include an Erosion Control Plan and BMPs to control erosion and sedimentation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1 would minimize impacts to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR p. 3.9-14)

5.5 Traffic and Circulation

5.5.1 Project-Level Impacts

Impact 3.15-1: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.15-1 that construction activity could add daily trips to roadways that already experience poor levels of service near the project area. (Draft EIR p. 3.15-1)

Mitigation Measure TR-1: Prior to construction, Metropolitan shall require the contractor(s) to prepare a Traffic Management Plan in accordance with professional engineering standards and the guidelines for safety and traffic provided in the Caltrans Construction Manual (revised 2008). The Traffic Management Plan would include, but not be limited to, the following strategies:

- Develop truck route plans to minimize impact to the significantly impact intersection of San Fernando Road/Sierra Highway during the p.m. peak hour, San Fernando Road/I-16-SR14 southbound off-ramp during a.m. and p.m. peak hours, San Fernando Road/Balboa Boulevard during p.m. peak hours, and I-5 southbound ramps/Roxford Street during p.m. peak hours.
- Avoid construction-related traffic to occur during peak travel periods.
- Implementation of staggered construction worker shifts to minimize project traffic during the peak hours.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or “substantially lessen” the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See *infra*, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: Construction-generated traffic would be temporary and therefore would not result in long-term degradation of operating conditions or levels of service on any roadways in the project area. The primary impacts from the movement of construction trucks would include short-term and intermittent lessening of roadway capacities due to slower movements and larger turning radii of the trucks compared to passenger vehicles. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1 would require the contractor(s) to prepare a Traffic Management Plan that would minimize impacts to specific intersections during peak travel periods, and implement staggered construction worker shifts to minimize project traffic. As a result, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR p. 3.15-30)

5.6 Cumulative

Concurrent construction of several projects in the vicinity of the Jensen Plant could result in cumulative short-term impacts associated with construction activities. The sections below address biological resources, cultural resources, and noise and vibration. (Draft EIR p. 4-6 and 4-8)

Biological Resources

Impacts to biological resources would be minimized through mitigation measures, and the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considerable.

Cultural Resources

Impacts to cultural resources would be minimized by mitigation measures, and the project's contribution to cumulative impacts for cultural resources would be less than significant.

Noise and Vibration

Construction noise would be temporary and impacts localized to the project site. There are no proposed construction sites within the immediate vicinity of the Jensen Plant. In accordance with proposed mitigation measures for construction noise impacts, the proposed project would not contribute significantly to cumulative ambient noise conditions.

CHAPTER 6

Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091, the following project impacts are significant environmental effects for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant environmental effects to below a level of significance. The adverse impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

6.1 Air Quality – Project Level

6.1.1 Project-Level Impacts

Impact 3.3-1: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.3-1 that construction of the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on air quality. (Draft EIR p. 3.3-13)

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Water or a stabilizing agent shall be applied to exposed surfaces at least two times per day to prevent generation of dust plumes.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: The construction contractor shall utilize at least one of the following measures at each vehicle egress from the project site to a paved public road:

- Install a pad consisting of washed gravel maintained in clean condition to a depth of at least six inches and extending at least 30 feet wide and at least 50 feet long;
- Pave the surface extending at least 100 feet and at least 20 feet wide; or,
- Utilize a wheel shaker/wheel spreading device consisting of raised dividers at least 24 feet long and 10 feet wide to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3: All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions).

Mitigation Measure AQ-4: Heavy-duty equipment operations shall be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts.

Mitigation Measure AQ-5: Ground cover in disturbed areas shall be replaced as quickly as possible.

Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.

Mitigation Measure AQ-7: Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil is carried onto adjacent public paved roads.

Mitigation Measure AQ-8: Construction equipment powered by 150-horsepower diesel engines or greater (e.g., graders and scrapers) shall require minimum of Tier III diesel particulate filters.

Mitigation Measure AQ-9: All diesel-powered construction equipment shall require control equipment that meets at a minimum Tier III emissions requirements. In the event Tier III equipment is not available, diesel powered construction equipment in use shall require emissions control equipment with a minimum of Tier II diesel standards.

Mitigation Measure AQ-10: Contractors shall maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturers' specifications.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or "substantially lessen"² the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See infra, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: The proposed project would result in substantial localized and regional construction emissions under Options 1 and 2, which are the two potential soil improvement scenarios discussed in the Draft EIR. Daily construction emissions associated with Option 1 would exceed the SCAQMD localized thresholds for particulate matter (PM) 2.5 and PM10 and regional thresholds for nitric oxide (NOx), PM2.5 and PM10. Further, daily construction emissions associated with Option 2 would exceed the SCAQMD localized thresholds for PM2.5 and PM10 and regional thresholds for NOx, PM2.5 and PM10. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-7 would ensure that fugitive dust emissions would be reduced by approximately 61 percent. Mitigation AQ-8 would reduce diesel particulate matter emissions by 25 percent. Mitigation Measures AQ-9 and AQ-10 would reduce engine emissions by approximately five percent. However, Option 1 mitigated construction

² Unlike the other findings made in this document, for this particular finding made, the term "substantially lessen" does not refer to fully mitigating the significant environmental impact. Please refer to Section 1.4, Findings Required under CEQA, of this document for further discussion and interpretation of the term "substantially lessen."

regional emissions would continue to exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds for volatile organic compounds (VOC), NO_x, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Mitigated construction regional emissions for Option 2 would continue to exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds for NO_x, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. The impact would be significant and unavoidable as the construction of the proposed project would exceed air quality standards. While Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-10 would reduce impacts to air quality emissions, the adverse impacts would remain significant and avoidable. (Draft EIR p. 3.3-13)

6.2 Noise

6.2.1 Project-Level Impacts

Impact 3.11-1: The Final EIR concludes in Impact 3.11-1 that construction of the proposed project could substantially generate noise levels in excess of standards. (Draft EIR p. 3.11-10)

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: All construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and noise attenuation devices.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-2: The construction contractor shall locate noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-3: All residential units located within 500 feet of the construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule of the proposed project. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet, shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints.

Nighttime Construction

In addition to Mitigation Measures NOISE-1 through NOISE-3, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented during nighttime construction activity.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-4: Noise control barriers eight feet tall or higher shall be used to line the perimeter of the concrete batch plant. The portion of the batch plant accessed by trucks shall be left open.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-5: Noise control barriers eight feet tall or higher shall surround drill rigs during drilling operations.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

Significant

Not Significant

Finding(s) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or “substantially lessen”³ the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See infra, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: Metropolitan finds that construction of the proposed project would potentially expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards. Construction activities would produce ambient noise that exceeds levels by more than 5 dBA. Metropolitan finds that implementation of Mitigation Measures NOISE-1 through NOISE-5 will not reduce the impacts to below a level of significance and would remain significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR p. 3.11-13)

6.3 Air Quality - Cumulative

6.3.1 Cumulative Impacts

Chapter 4: The Final EIR concludes in Chapter 4 that concurrent construction of the project with other projects in the air basin could exceed significance thresholds established by SCAQMD for pollutants that are already in non-attainment of federal standards. (Draft EIR p. 4-5)

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Water or a stabilizing agent shall be applied to exposed surfaces at least two times per day to prevent generation of dust plumes.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: The construction contractor shall utilize at least one of the following measures at each vehicle egress from the project site to a paved public road:

- Install a pad consisting of washed gravel maintained in clean condition to a depth of at least six inches and extending at least 30 feet wide and at least 50 feet long;
- Pave the surface extending at least 100 feet and at least 20 feet wide; or,
- Utilize a wheel shaker/wheel spreading device consisting of raised dividers at least 24 feet long and 10 feet wide to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3: All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions).

³ Unlike the other findings made in this document, for this particular finding made, the term “substantially lessen” does not refer to fully mitigating the significant environmental impact. Please refer to Section 1.4, Findings Required under CEQA, of this document for further discussion and interpretation of the term “substantially lessen.”

Mitigation Measure AQ-4: Heavy-duty equipment operations shall be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts.

Mitigation Measure AQ-5: Ground cover in disturbed areas shall be replaced as quickly as possible.

Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.

Mitigation Measure AQ-7: Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil is carried onto adjacent public paved roads.

Mitigation Measure AQ-8: Construction equipment powered by 150-horsepower diesel engines or greater (e.g., graders and scrapers) shall require minimum of Tier III diesel particulate filters.

Mitigation Measure AQ-9: All diesel-powered construction equipment shall require control equipment that meets at a minimum Tier III emissions requirements. In the event Tier III equipment is not available, diesel powered construction equipment in use shall require emissions control equipment with a minimum of Tier II diesel standards.

Mitigation Measure AQ-10: Contractors shall maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturers' specifications.

With Mitigation the Environmental Effects are Found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Finding(s) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or "substantially lessen"⁴ the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(1).)
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subdivision (a)(2).)
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Subdivision (a)(3).) See infra, Chapter 8, Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Rationale/Supporting Explanation: Construction of the proposed project would generate significant and unavoidable short-term emissions of criteria pollutants from excavation activity and use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1

⁴ Unlike the other findings made in this document, for this particular finding made, the term "substantially lessen" does not refer to fully mitigating the significant environmental impact. Please refer to Section 1.4, Findings Required under CEQA, of this document for further discussion and interpretation of the term "substantially lessen."

through AQ-7 would ensure that fugitive dust emissions would be reduced by approximately 61 percent. Mitigation AQ-8 would reduce diesel particulate matter emission by 25 percent. Mitigation Measures AQ-9 and AQ-10 would reduce engine emissions by approximately five percent. Mitigation would ensure implementation of the SCAQMD requirements to control fugitive dust at the construction site and other measures to limit construction dust and vehicle and equipment emissions. However, as discussed in Section 3.3, Air Quality, the project nevertheless would exceed regional and localized construction emission thresholds, resulting in significant and unavoidable adverse air quality impacts.

CHAPTER 7

Project Alternatives

Because the proposed project would result in unavoidable, significant environmental effects, as stated in Chapter 6 of this document, Metropolitan must consider the feasibility of any environmentally superior alternatives to the proposed project. Metropolitan must evaluate whether one or more of these alternatives could avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project's unavoidable, significant environmental effects. (*Citizens for Quality Growth v. City of Mount Shasta* (1988) 198 Cal.App.3d 433, 443-445 [243 Cal.Rptr. 727]; see also PRC Section 21002.)

In preparing and adopting findings, a Lead Agency need not necessarily address the feasibility of both mitigation measures and environmentally superior alternatives when contemplating approval of a proposed project with significant impacts. Where a significant impact can be mitigated to an acceptable level solely by the adoption of mitigation measures, the agency, in drafting its findings, has no obligation to consider the feasibility of environmentally superior alternatives, even if their impacts would be less severe than those of the proposed project as mitigated. (*Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515,521 [147 Cal.Rptr. 842]; see also *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 730-731 [270 Cal.Rptr. 650]; and *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403 [253 Cal.Rptr. 426].) Accordingly, in adopting findings concerning project alternatives, Metropolitan considers only those environmental impacts that, for the proposed project, are significant and cannot be avoided through mitigation.

An EIR should provide some discussion of how the Lead Agency or project proponent, in determining the scope of an EIR, narrowed the range of reasonable alternatives as required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(c). The preliminary discussion of how the range was focused need not be as extensive as the full alternatives analysis required by the guidelines. (See *Goleta II*, 52 Cal.3d 553, 569 [276 Cal.Rptr. 410]; *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 404-405 [253 Cal.Rptr. 4261].)

In *Goleta II* (see 52 Cal.3d 553, 564-566 [276 Cal.Rptr. 410]), the California Supreme Court emphasized that the range of alternatives to be included in an EIR should focus on those that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project. In that case, viewing the record as a whole, the Supreme Court concluded that the respondent county was justified in not treating as feasible (and thus not including in the challenged Draft EIR) various alternatives that “would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly.” The *State CEQA Guidelines* also state that: “Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts” (See *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(c)).

The No Project Alternative must be evaluated, and if it would be the environmentally superior alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified among the other alternatives (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)).

These findings examine the two project alternatives to the extent they lessen or avoid the proposed project's significant environmental effects. Metropolitan need not consider the alternatives with respect to the proposed project's environmental impacts that are not significant or are avoided through mitigation. The objectives of implementing the proposed project are as follows:

- Provide permanent facilities at the Jensen Plant with sufficient capacity to accommodate dewatering of solids generated from the water treatment process under design plant flow conditions (750 mgd);
- Replace temporary off-site capacity at the LADWP lagoons that will be lost on the expiration of the Metropolitan-LADWP agreement in 2014; and
- Reduce the need to discharge water treatment solids to the sanitary sewer.

In summary, the No Project Alternative does not meet the project objectives. No construction of permanent facilities at the Jensen Plant, and the expiration of the Metropolitan-LADWP lease agreement, would result in operations constrained by the conditions of the sanitary sewer permit and the discretion of the Bureau of Sanitation to issue a new permit. The cost of discharging solids would increase as well. At full operating capacity, the Jensen Plant would have to incur approximately \$29,000 a day.

The Lagoons and Sewer Alternative (Alternative 2) would be similar to the proposed project but does not include the design and construction of the dewatering facility. The Lagoons and Sewer Alternative would meet most of the project objectives, but the new planned facilities would continue to rely on discharging water treatment solids into the sanitary sewer, when the Jensen Plant is incapable of handling the design flow, and would continue to be constrained by the conditions of the sanitary sewer permit and the discretion of the Bureau of Sanitation to issue a new permit. The cost of discharging solids would increase as well. At full operating capacity, the Jensen Plant would have to incur approximately \$20,000 a day. Overall, the Lagoons and Sewer Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project as compared to the No Project Alternative.

7.1 No Project Alternative

According to Section 15126.6(e) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, discussion of the No Project Alternative must include a description of existing conditions and reasonably foreseeable future conditions that would exist if the project were not approved. Under the No Project Alternative, construction of the solids dewatering facility and lagoons would not be implemented. Under this alternative, the sanitary sewer would be the primary method for solids disposal at the Jensen Plant. The current Jensen Industrial Wastewater Permit would have to be amended to discharge all solids generated under the Jensen Plant's rated treatment capacity of 750 mgd. (Draft EIR p. 6-3)

Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the proposed project objectives. No permanent facilities would be constructed at the Jensen Plant and the Metropolitan-LADWP agreement would expire. The Jensen Plant's operations would be constrained by the conditions of the sanitary sewer permit and the discretion of the Bureau of Sanitation to issue a new permit. Furthermore, the operations of the Jensen Plant would also be constrained by the cost of discharging solids to the sewer. Therefore, implementation of the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the stated project objectives.

Under the No Project Alternative, the impacts identified in Chapters 3 and 4 that are associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would be avoided. However, the No Project Alternative would not result in the beneficial impacts associated with the proposed project, including providing permanent on-site facilities to accommodate dewatering of solids and reducing the need to discharge to the local sanitary sewer system. (Draft EIR p. 6-4)

7.2 Alternative 2: Lagoons and Sewer Alternative

Alternative 2 would follow similar plans as the proposed project, except it would not include the construction of the dewatering facility. Instead, solids would continue to be discharged to the sanitary sewer only when the lagoons are full. Alternative 2 would also result in a shorter construction period because there would be no need for soil stabilization for the belt press building. (Draft EIR p. 6-8)

Implementation of Alternative 2 would meet some of the project objectives, and would result in fewer impacts as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would avoid significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality and noise. However, this alternative would also be constrained by discretion of the Bureau of Sanitation to issue a new permit, and operations at the Jensen Plant would also be constrained by the cost of discharging solids to the sewer. (Draft EIR p. 6-8)

CHAPTER 8

Statement of Overriding Considerations

When a proposed project results in significant, unavoidable adverse impacts, CEQA requires the decision-making body of the Lead Agency to weigh the benefit of the proposed project against such environmental impacts in determining whether or not to approve the proposed project (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15043). In making this determination the Lead Agency is guided by the *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15093, which states:

- CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”
- When the Lead Agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The Statement of Overriding Considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- If an agency makes a Statement of Overriding Considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

In addition, PRC Section 21081(b) requires that when a public agency finds that economic, legal, social, technological or other reasons make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR and the project thereby continues to have significant unavoidable adverse impacts, the public agency must also find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh those significant unavoidable impacts of the project.

The Final EIR identified two alternatives to the proposed project: the No Project Alternative and the Lagoons and Sewer Alternative. These alternatives were evaluated to the extent to which they met the basic project objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening any significant adverse impacts of the proposed project.

For the reasons detailed in the Findings of Fact as well as in the EIR (Chapter 6 of the Draft EIR), only one of the alternatives would be environmentally superior to the proposed project (i.e., the Lagoons and Sewer Alternative). The sections below explain the overriding considerations Metropolitan relied on in selecting the proposed project rather than the environmentally superior alternative.

8.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

8.1.1 Air Quality

Based on the information and analysis set forth in the Final EIR and the record of proceedings, construction of the proposed project would result in significant impacts related to air quality. The proposed project has two potential soil improvement scenarios, Option 1 – Over-excavation and Recompaction, and Option 2 – Deep Soil Mixing. Under these two scenarios, both local and regional construction emissions exceed significance thresholds. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-10 would have Metropolitan establish protocols to reduce fugitive dust emissions, diesel particulates, and engine emissions. However, even with these measures, the proposed project’s construction emission would exceed local and regional air quality thresholds for specific air pollutants under Option 1 and Option 2. Adverse impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

8.1.2 Noise

Construction activities would result in noise levels that exceed significance thresholds under the City of Los Angeles noise ordinance. As a result of nighttime construction, surrounding sensitive receptors could experience adverse effects, such as interference with sleep patterns for nearby residential land uses. Furthermore, high noise levels generated during daytime construction work for 12-hour to 16-hour workday scenarios would generate temporary high ambient noise levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOISE-1 through NOISE-5 would assist in reducing and controlling noise levels. However, even with these measures construction work would exceed noise ordinance thresholds and would result in significant and unavoidable adverse impacts.

8.1.3 Cumulative Air Quality-Construction Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would generate significant and unavoidable short-term emissions of criteria pollutants from excavation activity and use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Concurrent construction of the project with other projects in the air basin would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions. Implementation of Air Quality Mitigation Measures (AQ-1 through AQ-10) would ensure implementation of the SCAQMD requirements to control fugitive dust at construction sites and other measures to limit construction dust and vehicle and equipment emissions. However, the project nevertheless would exceed regional and localized construction emission thresholds, resulting in significant and

unavoidable air quality impacts. Because the proposed project construction would exceed significance thresholds established by SCAQMD for activities within the air basin for pollutants that are already in non-attainment of federal standards, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

8.2 Project Benefits

Metropolitan has (i) independently reviewed the information in the Final EIR and the record of proceedings; (ii) made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially lessen the impacts resulting from the project to the extent feasible by adopting the mitigation measures identified in the EIR; and (iii) balanced the project's benefits against the project's significant unavoidable air quality and noise impacts. Metropolitan finds that the project's benefits outweigh the project's temporary significant unavoidable impacts. Metropolitan finds that the following benefits are overriding considerations that warrant approval of the project notwithstanding the project's significant unavoidable impacts to air quality and noise. Substantial evidence supports the various benefits as discussed below.

8.2.1 Solids Handling Facility

The Jensen Plant treats drinking water conveyed to a large portion of Los Angeles County and portions of Orange County. Currently the plant does not have solids handling facilities to meet its treatment capacity. Metropolitan relies on off-site solids drying lagoons under a temporary agreement with LADWP. These off-site lagoons only provide up to 15 percent of the solids handling capacity needed to accommodate Jensen Treatment Plant's full treatment capacity.

Construction of the proposed permanent solids dewatering facility and lagoon system would increase solids handling capacity to accommodate the Jensen Plant's rated treatment capacity of 750 mgd. The proposed new facilities would allow Metropolitan to adequately meet long-term solids handling processing needs. The new facilities would replace the current but temporary off-site capacity at the LADWP lagoons, which only provides approximately 15 percent of the total Jensen Plant treatment capacity of 750 mgd. The proposed project would provide solids handling and drying facilities sufficient to accommodate the full 750 mgd treatment capacity. This critical benefit of the project avoids the need to use the sanitary sewer to dispose of raw water solids, reducing regional impacts and costs of solids disposal. (Draft EIR p. 2-1)

8.3 Statement of Overriding Considerations

After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed project, Metropolitan has determined that the significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified in Section 8.1 may be considered "acceptable" due to the specific considerations listed in Section 8.2 which outweigh the significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project.

Metropolitan has considered information contained in the Final EIR as well as the public testimony and record of proceedings in which the proposed project was considered. In addition, Metropolitan commits to the proposed mitigation measures and acknowledges that project benefits outweigh the few significant and unavoidable adverse impacts identified in Section 8.1 of this document. In making this determination and commitment, Metropolitan incorporates by reference the Findings of Fact (Chapters 1 through 7 of this document) and the proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Chapter 9), as well as all of the supporting evidence cited therein and in the record of proceedings and administrative record.

CHAPTER 9

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project has been prepared in accordance with PRC Section 21081.6 and *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(d). Metropolitan will use this MMRP to track compliance with the project mitigation measures. Metropolitan's Board of Directors will consider the MMRP during the certification hearing for the Final EIR. The final MMRP will incorporate all mitigation measures adopted for the proposed project.

This MMRP summarizes potentially significant impacts and mitigation commitments identified in the Jensen Solids Handling Facility Project Final EIR. **Table 1** provides the MMRP with the mitigation measures, corresponding implementation, monitoring, and reporting tasks, responsible agency, and timing of implementation. Impacts and mitigation measures are presented in the same order as in the Final EIR. The columns in the table provide the following information:

- **Mitigation Measures:** The action(s) that will be taken to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.
- **Implementation, Monitoring, and Reporting Tasks:** This column outlines the appropriate steps to implement and verify compliance with the mitigation measures.
- **Monitoring Schedule:** This column indicates the general schedule for conducting each monitoring task, either prior to construction, during construction, and/or after construction.
- **Responsibility:** This column lists the agency responsible for ensuring implementation of the mitigation measure. Metropolitan or one of the Responsible Agencies will assume responsibility for all monitoring and reporting actions.

TABLE 1
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM – JENSEN SOLIDS HANDLING FACILITY PROJECT

Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Process	Monitoring Timing	Responsible Person(s)
3.3: Air Quality			
Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Water or a stabilizing agent shall be applied to exposed surfaces at least two times per day to prevent generation of dust plumes.	Site Inspection	During Construction	Metropolitan
<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-2: The construction contractor shall utilize at least one of the following measures at each vehicle egress from the project site to a paved public road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install a pad consisting of washed gravel maintained in clean condition to a depth of at least six inches and extending at least 30 feet wide and at least 50 feet long; • Pave the surface extending at least 100 feet and at least 20 feet wide; • Utilize a wheel shaker/wheel spreading device consisting of raised dividers at least 24 feet long and 10 feet wide to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages; or 	Site Inspection	During Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure AQ-3: All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions).	Site Inspection	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure AQ-4: Heavy-duty equipment operations shall be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts.	Site Inspection	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure AQ-5: Ground cover in disturbed areas shall be replaced as quickly as possible.	Site Inspection	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 miles-per-hour or less.	Site Inspection	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure AQ-7: Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil is carried onto adjacent public paved roads.	Site Inspection	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure AQ-8: Construction equipment powered by 150-horsepower diesel engines or greater (e.g., graders and scrapers) shall require minimum of Tier III diesel particulate filters.	Site Inspection	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure AQ-9: All diesel-powered construction equipment shall require control equipment that meets at a minimum Tier III emissions requirements. In the event Tier III equipment is not available, diesel powered construction equipment in use shall require emissions control equipment with a minimum of Tier II diesel standards.	Site Inspection	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure AQ-10: Contractors shall maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturers' specifications	Site Inspection	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan

TABLE 1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM – JENSEN SOLIDS HANDLING FACILITY PROJECT

Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Process	Monitoring Timing	Responsible Person(s)
3.4: Biological Resources			
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Preconstruction Nest Survey. If project construction activities are undertaken between February 1 and August 31, a qualified biologist shall survey the project site no more than three days prior to commencement of disturbance and determine whether the proposed activities could disrupt the nesting of any listed migratory bird species under the MBTA. Disruption of nesting could be caused by the physical removal of an active nest, increased human activity near an active nest, loud noises, etc. If project construction cannot be initiated during this time period, site grubbing and grading during this time period can minimize the potential for bird nesting during the remainder of the construction period.</p> <p>If an active nest is discovered, the monitor shall observe the birds' behaviors when construction activities commence to determine whether construction activity should be ceased by Metropolitan or altered by Metropolitan in the nest vicinity in order to avoid nest failure. If any areas need to be avoided, the limits of avoidance may be demarcated with flagging or fencing. Nesting birds that are observed within impact areas shall be avoided until all nestlings have fledged and nesting activities have been concluded.</p>	Biologist Verification	Pre- Construction	Metropolitan
3.5: Cultural Resources			
<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Monitoring by a qualified archaeologist during ground disturbing activities. A qualified archaeologist shall be retained to monitor during construction-related excavation activities within native alluvial materials. The duration and timing of monitoring shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with Metropolitan and based on the grading plans. In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work must be halted in the vicinity of the discovery until the qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the resources, and if necessary, have such resources recovered.</p>	Site Inspection/Survey	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Avoidance of cultural resources. Prior to construction, Metropolitan shall prepare or have a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP) and/or Treatment Plan (TP) prepared, per <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4, to outline the appropriate action needed to recover the cultural materials in a professional manner. The CRMMP/TP shall establish the criteria utilized to evaluate the historic significance (per CEQA) of the unanticipated discoveries of unknown archaeological resources identified during construction activities, as well as identify the appropriate data recovery methods and procedures to mitigate the effect of the project upon those resources determined historically significant. If prehistoric or historic sites are encountered during construction-related earth-moving activities, the CRMMP/TP shall address the recovery, analysis, laboratory procedures, and final Report of Findings requirements that are necessary to meet the CEQA, and all state, city, and local regulations.</p>	Site Inspection/Survey	During Construction	Metropolitan

TABLE 1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM – JENSEN SOLIDS HANDLING FACILITY PROJECT

Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Process	Monitoring Timing	Responsible Person(s)
<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during ground disturbing activities. A qualified paleontologist shall be retained to monitor during construction-related excavation activities in native deposits. The duration and timing of monitoring shall be determined by the paleontologist in consultation with Metropolitan and based on the construction-related excavation activities.</p>	Site Monitoring	During Construction	Metropolitan
<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Accidental discovery of paleontological resources. If paleontological resources such as fossil remains or fossiliferous sediment are encountered during the course of construction and monitoring, ground-disturbing activities shall be directed away from the vicinity of the find so that the paleontologist can evaluate the resources and recover them as appropriate. The paleontologist shall collect the material and record stratigraphic cross sections as well as map/graph pertinent geologic units. Fossils must be cleaned, analyzed and catalogued in order to be accessioned for curation at an appropriate repository. A final report shall be prepared that discusses any findings of paleontological resources.</p>	Site Monitoring	During Construction	Metropolitan
<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-5: Halt Work if Human Skeletal Remains are Identified During Construction. If human skeletal remains are encountered during the course of construction activities, Metropolitan shall immediately halt all construction activities and contact the Los Angeles County coroner in order to evaluate the skeletal remains, as well as comply with the regulatory requirements of Section 15064.5 (e)(1) of the <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i>. If it is determined the skeletal remains are Native American, Metropolitan shall consult with the NAHC, pursuant to the Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 (c), and Public Resource Code 5097.98 (as amended by AB 2641). Public Resource Code 5097.8 provides that the landowner will ensure that the Native American remains, and the immediate vicinity, are protected from damage or further construction disturbances until consultation between Metropolitan and the Most Likely Descendant has transpired, resulting in a determination regarding the handling of the uncovered remains and any future unanticipated human remains discoveries in the immediate vicinity.</p>	Site Monitoring	During Construction	Metropolitan
<p>3.8: Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p>			
<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Metropolitan shall require the construction contractor(s) to implement best management practices (BMPs) for handling hazardous materials during construction of the project. The use of the construction BMPs shall minimize negative effects on groundwater and soils, workers, and the public, and will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow manufacturers' recommendations and regulatory requirements for use, storage, and disposal of chemical products and hazardous materials used in construction. • During routine maintenance of construction equipment, properly contain and remove used grease and oils. • Properly dispose of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals. 	Site Monitoring	During Construction	Metropolitan
<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Metropolitan shall require the construction contractor(s) to implement safety measures in accordance with General Industry Safety Orders for Spill and</p>	Site Monitoring	During Construction	Metropolitan

TABLE 1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM – JENSEN SOLIDS HANDLING FACILITY PROJECT

Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Process	Monitoring Timing	Responsible Person(s)
<p>Overflow Control (CCR Title 8, Sections 5163-5167) to protect the project area from contamination due to accidental release of hazardous materials. The safety measures shall include, but not be limited to, the following:</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazardous materials shall be stored in containers that are chemically inert to and appropriate for the type and quantity of the hazardous substance. • Containers shall not be stored where they are exposed to heat sufficient enough to rupture the containers or cause leakage. • Specific information shall be provided regarding safe procedures and other precautions before cleaning or subsequent use or disposal of hazardous materials containers. 			
<p>Disposal of all hazardous materials shall be in compliance with applicable California hazardous waste disposal laws. The construction contractor(s) shall contact the local fire agency and the Los Angeles City Fire Department, for any site-specific requirements regarding hazardous materials or hazardous waste containment or handling.</p>			
<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: In the event of an accidental release of hazardous materials during construction, containment and clean up shall occur in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.</p>	Site Monitoring	During Construction	Metropolitan
<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: Oil and other solvents used during maintenance of construction equipment shall be recycled or disposed of in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. All hazardous materials shall be transported, handled, and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.</p>	Site Monitoring	During Construction	Metropolitan
<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-5: Metropolitan shall require the construction contractor(s) to prepare and implement a Safety Program to ensure the health and safety of construction workers and the public during project construction. The Safety Program shall include an injury and illness prevention program, as site-specific safety plan, and information on the appropriate personal protective equipment to be used during construction.</p>	Site Monitoring	During Construction	Metropolitan
3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality			
<p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1: Metropolitan shall require its construction contractor(s) to prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in accordance with the California General Permit 2009-009-SWQ, that identifies specific actions and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent storm water pollution during construction activities.</p>	Site Monitoring	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
<p>Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2: If groundwater dewatering is required for construction and the groundwater cannot be pumped to the WWRPs, Metropolitan's construction contractor(s) shall obtain the required NPDES discharge permit from the Los Angeles RWQCB - WDRs for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Board Order No. R4-2008-0032, General NPDES Permit No. CAG994004).</p>	Site Monitoring	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan

TABLE 1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM – JENSEN SOLIDS HANDLING FACILITY PROJECT

Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Process	Monitoring Timing	Responsible Person(s)
3.11: Noise and Vibration			
Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: All construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and noise attenuation devices.	Consultation	During Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure NOISE-2: The construction contractor shall locate noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses.	Equipment Inspection	During Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure NOISE-3: All residential units located within 500 feet of the construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule of the proposed project. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet, shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints.	Consultation	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure NOISE-4: Noise control barriers eight feet tall or higher shall be used to line the perimeter of the concrete batch plant. The portion of the batch plant accessed by trucks shall be left open.	Site Inspection	During Construction	Metropolitan
Mitigation Measure NOISE-5: Noise control barriers eight feet tall or higher shall surround drill rigs during drilling operations.	Site Inspection	During Construction	Metropolitan
3.15: Transportation/Traffic			
Mitigation Measure TR-1: Prior to construction, Metropolitan shall require the contractor(s) to prepare a Traffic Management Plan in accordance with professional engineering standards and the guidelines for safety and traffic provided in the Caltrans Construction Manual (revised 2008). The Traffic Management Plan would include, but not be limited to, the following strategies:	Consultation	Pre-Construction	Metropolitan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop truck route plans to minimize impact to the significantly impact intersection of San Fernando Road/Sierra Highway during the p.m. peak hour, San Fernando Road/I-16-SR14 southbound off-ramp during a.m. and p.m. peak hours, San Fernando Road/Balboa Boulevard during p.m. peak hours, and I-5 southbound ramps/Roxford Street during p.m. peak hours. • Avoid construction-related traffic to occur during peak travel periods. • Implementation of staggered construction worker shifts to minimize project traffic during the peak hours. 			