

**SECTION 5.0**  
**EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT**

---

## 5.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

### 5.1 OVERVIEW

The environmental analysis of the Scholl Canyon Landfill Expansion (proposed project) during the Initial Study (IS) process determined that the proposed project would not result in potentially significant adverse impacts for a number of environmental parameters. This section summarizes those environmental parameters that are not further analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). For detailed information regarding this analysis, refer to Appendix A of the DEIR. For all environmental parameters where a potentially significant adverse impacts was identified during the IS process, the environmental analysis is provided in Section 6.0 (Resource Specific Analysis) of the DEIR.

### 5.2 AESTHETICS

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

According to the City of Glendale General Plan, there are no state scenic highways located adjacent to, or within view of, the project site. Therefore, no impacts to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Other aesthetic categories with potentially significant impacts are discussed in Section 6.1 (Aesthetics).

### 5.3 AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

The proposed project would not impact any prime, unique, or farmland of statewide importance. There is no existing prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance within or adjacent to the project site and no agricultural activities take place on the project site. No agricultural use zone currently exists within the City of Glendale, nor are any agricultural zones proposed. Therefore, no impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

The proposed project is the expansion of an existing landfill and would not result in the cancellation of any Williamson Act contracts. In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural uses, as none exist within the City of Glendale. Therefore, no impacts related to conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

There is no farmland in the vicinity of, or on, the project site. The proposed project would not result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses and does not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to location and nature could result in the conversion of farmland. Therefore,

no impacts related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

There are no agriculture resources that would be significantly impacted and, thus, there is no discussion of the agriculture resource parameter in Section 6.0 (Resource Specific Analysis).

#### **5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

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

At the time of the release of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and IS, it was anticipated that no federally protected wetlands were present within the vicinity of the proposed project, and no such areas were present on site or adjacent to the project site. However, during a recent site visit, it was concluded that riparian habitat is present and the potential to impact this riparian habitat could occur. Additional analysis is presented in Section 6.3 (Biological Resources) of the DEIR.

- *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

According to the Glendale General Plan, there is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the City of Glendale. There is, however, a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) program in the City of Glendale, which is implemented with the intention to preserve these designated sensitive areas. According to the Glendale General Plan, the Scholl Canyon Landfill (SCLF) project site is not located within the SEA. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the SEA program or other habitat conservation plans. Therefore, no impacts related to conflicts with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Other biological resource categories with potentially significant impacts are discussed in Section 6.3 (Biological Resources).

#### **5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

The project site does not contain, and is not located near, any significant historical resource sites as identified in the Glendale General Plan. Therefore, no impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

According to a 1989 geologic map of the Pasadena Quadrangle by Dibblee, nearly the entire project site is underlain by unfossiliferous granite rock. The only sedimentary unit (younger alluvium) with any potential for containing fossil remains underlies the floor of Scholl Canyon at the western edge of the project site (away from horizontal expansion). Normally, younger alluvium is considered too young at

and near the surface to contain remains old enough to be considered fossilized. Moreover, considering the fact that the canyon floor lies immediately adjacent to steep slopes underlain by granite rock, the younger alluvium is likely too coarse grained to have preserved any remains, fossilized or otherwise. Therefore, impacts related to paleontological resources would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

Other cultural resource categories with potentially significant impacts are discussed in Section 6.4 (Cultural Resources).

## 5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?*

The proposed project does not include the construction of new septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Other geology and soils/hydrogeology resource categories with potentially significant impacts are discussed in Section 6.5 (Geology and Soils/Hydrogeology).

## 5.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

The SCLF is a permitted Class III non-hazardous waste landfill that does not accept hazardous, radioactive, or explosive waste for on site disposal. Currently, an extensive waste checking program is implemented on site which includes load monitoring at the scale houses and random load checking. All trucks entering the scales are screened for radioactive materials and visually inspected for hazardous waste to ensure no hazardous materials enter the landfill. There is an above-ground diesel storage tank at the SCLF's equipment service and storage facility where on site fueling of heavy-duty equipment is performed. Both the operation and refueling of heavy construction equipment does have the potential to result in on site spills and leaks of fuels, oils, and other liquids. These existing operations would continue over the extended life of the SCLF under the proposed project. However, hazardous materials used on site for existing operations and under the proposed project would be handled according to existing and applicable state and federal regulations which are aimed at minimizing the potential for spills and leaks. Therefore, impacts related to hazards to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

It should be noted that greenhouse gases are addressed in Section 6.6 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the DEIR.

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

There are residential and public uses in close proximity to the project site. Similar to existing conditions, no hazardous wastes would be disposed of at the landfill under the proposed project. Required compliance with California Department of Resources Recycling and Reuse (CalRecycle), Los County Department of Public Health (LADPH), Air Quality Management District, and Sanitation Districts programs and safety and hazardous waste regulations would minimize the potential for impacts due to hazardous wastes. Therefore, impacts related to reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

It should be noted that methane gases from decomposition are addressed in Section 6.2 (Air Quality) of the DEIR.

- *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the SCLF. Therefore, no impacts related to hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

Based on a search of the Government Code Section 65962.5 “Cortese” list, the SCLF is not listed as a hazardous materials site and is not near any superfund or cleanup sites. Therefore, no impacts related to being located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public airport is the Burbank (Bob Hope) Airport, which is approximately nine miles west of the SCLF. Therefore, no impacts related to public or public use airport safety hazards would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?*

No private airstrips are located in the City of Glendale or in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any safety hazards for people residing on the project site. Therefore, no impacts related to private airstrip safety hazards would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

The proposed project would not interfere with the County Evacuation Route or with the City Disaster Response Route. All traffic heading to and from the project site would continue to be exclusively on Scholl Canyon Road, which is not part of any evacuation or disaster response route as shown in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). The nearest roads used in the County Evacuation Route are SR 134 and Verdugo Road. Landfill operations would not interfere with these routes during an emergency. Therefore, no impacts related to the impairment or interference of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Other hazards and hazardous material categories with potentially significant impacts are discussed in Section 6.7 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials).

## **5.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

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

The proposed project does not include any components that would propose groundwater extraction for use on site. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to groundwater depletion that would contribute to a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the regional groundwater table. Therefore, impacts related to groundwater supplies would be considered less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*
- *Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*

According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003), no portion of the project site is located within a 100-year floodplain. In addition, the proposed project does not include housing. Therefore, no impacts related to the placement of housing or structures within the 100-year flood hazard area would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

The proposed project is not anticipated to result in any impacts related to flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within inundation zones from failure of upstream dams. Therefore, no impacts related to flooding or inundation would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Other hydrology and water quality resource categories with potentially significant impacts are discussed in two separate sections in the DEIR, namely Section 6.8 (Surface Water Hydrology) and Section 6.9 (Water Quality).

## 5.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

- *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

The proposed project would not physically divide an established community because the project involves no expansion of the landfill property and no change in existing site activities. The proposed project would not entail the displacement of any residential uses or the use of any land designated for residential uses. Therefore, no impacts related to the physical division of an established community would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

Although it was determined in the IS (refer to Appendix A of the DEIR) that the proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts related to conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation, according to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Intergovernmental Review (IGR), the proposed project is considered regionally significant and needs to be determined if it is consistent, not consistent, or not applicable to SCAG goals, policies, and principles. Based on applicable goals/policies/principles of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Growth Vision Report (GVR) identified by SCAG in their NOP comment letter, it has been determined that proposed project would not conflict with SCAG's RCPG, RTP, and GVR. For detailed information regarding the consistency analysis, please refer to Appendix E of the DEIR. Therefore, impacts related to consistency with SCAG's RCPG, RTP, and GVR would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

According to the City of Glendale General Plan, there is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the City of Glendale. There is, however, an SEA program in the City of Glendale, which is implemented with the intention to preserve these designated sensitive areas. According to the Glendale General Plan, the project site is not located within the City's SEA. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the SEA program or other habitat conservation plans. Therefore, no impacts related to conflicts with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

There are no land use and planning resources that would be significantly impacted and, thus, there is no discussion of the land use and planning parameter in Section 6.0 (Resource Specific Analysis).

## 5.10 MINERAL RESOURCES

- *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*
- *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

According to the Glendale General Plan, there are no mineral resource zones in the City of Glendale that are of statewide or regional importance. Therefore, no impacts related to the loss of availability of a mineral resource valuable to the region or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

There are no mineral resources that would be significantly impacted and, thus, there is no discussion of the mineral resources parameter in Section 6.0 (Resource Specific Analysis).

## 5.11 NOISE

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

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public airport is the Burbank (Bob Hope) Airport, which is approximately nine miles west of the SCLF. Therefore, no impacts related to excessive noise levels from a public or public use airport would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?*

There are no private airstrips located on or within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no impacts related to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Other noise resource categories with potentially significant impacts are discussed in Section 6.10 (Noise).

## 5.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

- *Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

The proposed project would continue municipal solid waste disposal and landfilling operations at the SCLF. The proposed project does not include new residences or extending any major infrastructure (i.e., sewer or water lines, roads, etc.) that could support additional development. There may be temporary periods requiring additional personnel, such as during site development activities; however, no substantial new employment would be generated by the proposed project that could potentially contribute to additional demand for housing or services in the surrounding area. Therefore, no impacts related to population growth would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*
- *Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The proposed project would not result in the removal or demolition of any existing residential units because there are no existing residential uses on the landfill property. The proposed project would not entail the displacement of any residential uses or the use of any land designated for residential uses. Therefore, no impacts related to displacement of existing housing or people would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

There are no population and housing resources that would be significantly impacted and, thus, there is no discussion of the population and housing parameter in Section 6.0 (Resource Specific Analysis).

### **5.13 PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

- *Fire protection?*

The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The nearest fire station is Station 25 located at 353 N. Chevy Chase Drive, approximately two miles from the project site. Fires could be caused at the SCLF when combustible refuse, vegetation, or litter in the landfill is ignited by sparks from vehicles, lighted cigarettes, or matches thrown from vehicles or from tipping of hot or smoldering loads. Current practices at this landfill to reduce the potential for fire and for rapid control of fires, should they occur, include keeping fire extinguishers in all site vehicles, frequent site watering for dust control, on site water storage, prohibiting smoking on site, clearing vegetation and using bulldozers to smother fires with soil. The proposed project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection associated with the increased life of the landfill. However, it is anticipated that existing personnel and equipment at Fire Station 25 would be adequate to provide fire protection services to the SCLF under the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to fire protection would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

- *Police protection?*

Existing law enforcement service in the area would be adequate to meet the demand for police protection services under the proposed project because extending the life of the landfill would not require additional services beyond those currently provided. During non-operational hours, the SCLF is patrolled by security personnel. Therefore, no impacts related to police protection would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

○ *Schools?*

The proposed project would not adversely impact schools because no population increase or shifts in population would occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts related to schools would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

○ *Parks?*

The proposed project would not entail the construction of residential or commercial uses that would result in an increase in park usage or the need for new/altered parks. Therefore, no impacts related to parks would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

○ *Other public facilities?*

The proposed project is not anticipated to adversely affect the City's overall ability to provide services citywide. There may be brief temporary periods requiring additional personnel, such as during site development activities; however, the potential increase in employees and any other changes are not anticipated to result in the need for new or altered government facilities or services. Therefore, no impacts related to other public facilities would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

It should be noted that the proposed project would result in an incremental increase in the need for road maintenance because the traffic generated on roads leading to the SCLF would occur over a longer timeframe due to their extended lives. However, this increased maintenance responsibility for the Sanitation Districts and City of Glendale would be minor and would be financed by the General Fund revenues and other funding sources budgeted by these agencies for road maintenance. Therefore, impacts related to road maintenance would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

There are no public service resources that would be significantly impacted and, thus, there is no discussion of the public services parameter in Section 6.0 (Resource Specific Analysis).

## **5.14 RECREATION**

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

The proposed project would not entail the construction of residential or commercial uses that would result in an increased use of area parks or recreational facilities. There may be temporary periods requiring additional personnel, such as during site development activities. However, it is not anticipated that this increase in employees would contribute significantly to the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Therefore, no impacts related to an increase in the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

The proposed project does not include the construction of recreational facilities either on or off the SCLF property. Therefore, no impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

There are no recreation resources that would be significantly impacted and, thus, there is no discussion of the recreation parameter in Section 6.0 (Resource Specific Analysis).

## **5.15 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**

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

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private air strip. Therefore, no impacts related to changes to air traffic patterns would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. Therefore, no impacts related to hazardous design features or incompatible uses of roads would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

The proposed project would continue to exclusively use Scholl Canyon Road for public access to and from the SCLF. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts related to inadequate emergency access would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?*

Parking for employees and vehicles waiting for inspection or to deposit loads is currently provided on the SCLF. In the event that additional parking is temporarily needed as a result of the proposed project, it also would be provided on the landfill property. No off site parking would be required under the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts related to inadequate parking capacity would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

Trucks transporting municipal solid waste to SCLF would operate on public roads consistent with laws and regulations controlling vehicle traffic, similar to existing conditions associated with trucks currently accessing the landfill. Alternative modes of transportation including rail, bus, transit, bicycling, carpooling, and vanpooling would not be adversely affected by these truck operations on public roads. Therefore, no impacts related to conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Other transportation and traffic categories with potentially significant impacts are discussed in Section 6.11 (Transportation and Traffic).

## 5.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- *Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*
- *Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

There may be temporary periods requiring additional personnel, such as during site development activities. However, this minor increase would not substantially increase the demand for potable water at the landfill for employee sanitary uses or in a substantial increase in the amount of wastewater generated at the landfill. In addition, the minor increase in the production of wastewater generated by landfill employees would not be sufficient to exceed capacity at existing wastewater treatment facilities or result in changes in those existing facilities. Therefore, no impacts related to an exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements or the expansion or construction of water or wastewater treatment facilities would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

The proposed project would extend the operating life of the landfill. Therefore, the proposed project would result in an increase in the total amount of water needed over time at the landfill for employee sanitary uses, dust control, earthwork, on site road construction, and other on site improvements. However, the proposed project expansion is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the amount of water currently used daily at the landfill because any additional personnel would be temporary during site development. The existing water facilities and supplies serving the landfill are anticipated to be adequate to continue providing water to the landfill over the extended life of the SCLF. Therefore, no impacts related to water supplies would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

The proposed project would extend the life of the landfill and would result in an increase in the total amount of sewage generated at the landfill over the extended life of the landfill. There may be temporary periods requiring additional personnel, such as during site development activities. However, this personnel increase is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in the amount of sewage currently generated daily at the SCLF. The existing wastewater facilities at the landfill and serving the landfill are adequate to accommodate the additional sewage generated at the SCLF over the extended life of the landfill. Therefore, no impacts related to wastewater treatment capacity would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- *Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*
- *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

The proposed project would extend the life and capacity of the SCLF. The proposed project itself would not result in the generation of additional municipal solid waste and is proposed to meet existing and future needs for municipal solid waste disposal. Therefore, no impacts related to municipal solid waste disposal or compliance within solid waste disposal regulations would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

The only utilities and service systems resource category with potentially significant impacts is related to the need for new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities and is, thus, discussed in Section 6.8 (Surface Water Drainage).