



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

---

---

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
FOR  
EXPANSION OF THE LOS ANGELES  
COUNTY RECYCLING MARKET  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE**

---

---

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
FOR  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE**

I. Location and Brief Description

The project is the expansion of the Los Angeles County Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ) to include the cities of Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance. Currently, the Los Angeles County RMDZ encompasses all the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles and the cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, and Vernon.

The RMDZ program is an economic and technical assistance program that includes a low interest loan, which assists targeted businesses located in the RMDZ. The businesses must manufacture products using recycled materials as a feedstock or process difficult to recycle materials, such as construction and demolition debris.

In June 1994, the Board of Supervisors authorized an application to the California Integrated Waste Management Board for the establishment of the Los Angeles County RMDZ, which encompassed the unincorporated area of Florence-Firestone. The following year, the RMDZ was expanded to include several member cities and the unincorporated area of Altadena. Expansions have been authorized several times since to include all the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles and the current member cities. Since 1994, the RMDZ has assisted 20 companies and funded loans which totaled more than 12 million dollars.

II. Mitigation Measures Included in the Project to Avoid Potentially Significant Effects

No significant effects are identified.

III. Finding of No Significant Effect

Based on the attached Initial Study and Attachment A-Discussion of Environmental Factors, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

## INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. **Project Title:** Los Angeles County Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ)
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Environmental Programs Division, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803-1331.
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Mr. David Coscia (626) 458-3523.
4. **Project Location:** The unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles; current member cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, Vernon; and proposed new member cities of Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803-1331.
6. **General Plan Designation:** The Los Angeles County General Plan and the General Plans of the current member cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, Vernon; and the General Plans of the proposed new member cities of Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance.
7. **Zoning:** The project area is zoned for community commercial, commercial manufacturing, commercial residential, industrial, low density residential, low/medium density residential, major commercial, medium density residential, public use, residential parking, agricultural and transportation corridor.
8. **Description of Project:** The Project is the expansion of the Los Angeles County Recycling Market Development Zone as designated by the California Integrated Waste Management Board. The RMDZ program is an economic and technical assistance program which includes a low interest loan program available to manufacturers within the RMDZ that make products from recycled materials. Currently, the Los Angeles County RMDZ encompasses the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and the cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, and Vernon. The RMDZ seeks to expand the zone by including the cities of Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**
  - A. **Project Site** – The project is located within the Los Angeles County RMDZ, which will encompass all the unincorporated areas of the County and the cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, Vernon, Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance. For the most part, the area consists of single family residences, multi-family dwelling units, businesses, and commercial, agricultural, and industrial establishments. Some undeveloped

land exists in the northern portions of the County in the areas known as the Antelope Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley.

**B. Surrounding Properties** – Los Angeles County RMDZ is surrounded by the Counties of Kern, Orange, San Bernardino, and Ventura. Within the boundaries of the County of Los Angeles, separate RMDZs are administered by the cities of Long Beach, Los Angeles, and Santa Clarita.

**10. Other agencies whose approval is required (and permits needed):** A re-designation application will be submitted to the California Integrated Waste Management Board for the expansion of the RMDZ. This application requires the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors to approve this ND for the expansion of the RMDZ as the lead agency. In addition, the Board of Supervisor will be asked to adopt a resolution initiating the State designation for the expanded Los Angeles County RMDZ. To obtain this re-designation, each City Council of the Cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, Vernon, Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance will also adopt resolutions completing the re-designation application of the Los Angeles County RMDZ.

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED


The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems     | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a potentially significant impact or potentially significant unless mitigated impact on the environment, but at least one effect a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



---

Signature

3-20-08

Date

Hossam Banna

---

Printed Name

LACDPW

For

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1 A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2 All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3 "Potential Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potential Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
- 4 "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potential Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5 Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR or other California Environmental Quality Act process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.
- 6 Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references, information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans and zoning ordinances). See the sample question below. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

### LOS ANGELES COUNTY RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> - Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				X
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b> - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a)	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 nonagricultural use?				X
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?				X
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for zone precursors)?				X
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> - Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species; or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b> - Would the project:					
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> - Would the project:					
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a know fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?			X
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X
	iv)	Landslides?			X
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X
	c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			X
	d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X
	e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** - Would the project:

	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X
	b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X
	d)	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?			X
	e)	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 area?			X
	f)	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 area?			X
	g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X
	h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> - Would the project:					
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X
	b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge 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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X
	c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X
	d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X
	e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X
	f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X
	g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X
	h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
	i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X
	j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> - Would the project:					
	a)	Physically divide an established community?			X
	b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any 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?			X
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> - Would the project:					
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?			X
	b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?			X
<b>XI. NOISE</b> - Would the project result in:					
	a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			X
	b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X
	e)	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 area to excessive noise levels?			X
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> - Would the project:					
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>					
	a)	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?			X
		Police protection?			X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Schools?				X
	Parks?				X
	Other public facilities?				X
<b>XIV. RECREATION-</b>					
	a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
	b) 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?				X
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -</b> Would the project:					
	a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
	b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?				X
	c) 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?				X
	d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
	e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
	f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
	g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -</b> Would the project:					
	a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
	b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
	c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
	d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	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?				X
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g)	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				X
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

**XVIII. DISCUSSION OF WAYS TO MITIGATE SIGNIFICANCE EFFECTS**

Section 15041 (a) of the State California Environmental Quality Act guidelines states that a lead agency for a project has authority to require changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. No significant effects have been identified.

## ATTACHMENT A

### DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS LOS ANGELES COUNTY RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE

The expansion of the Los Angeles County RMDZ will have no impact on the environment. This finding includes no impact on the air quality, traffic conditions, and land use impacts in the RMDZ program area. The RMDZ program is an incentive program, which offers the possibility of financial, technical, and marketing assistance to businesses that undertake projects that will add market value to waste materials that would otherwise be disposed of in a landfill. Businesses which operate in the Los Angeles County RMDZ must still meet the same zoning standards and obtain the same environmental permits and clearance as businesses that are not in the Los Angeles County RMDZ. The Los Angeles County RMDZ is not relaxing any permitting or environmental regulations. Projects that may qualify for the RMDZ program are activities or projects that would be permitted, regardless of the RMDZ program. The adoption of this Negative Declaration does not alleviate the need to perform necessary CEQA review on future projects that receive RMDZ program assistance.

The Los Angeles County RMDZ has been in operation since July of 1994 without a significant negative environmental impact and in fact may have possible positive impacts on the environment. One of the primary goals of the program is to assist businesses that are increasing the amount of waste diverted from area landfills. To this end, the program is actually creating a positive environmental impact by diverting waste that would normally be disposed of in a landfill and instead utilizing it for a beneficial use.

The expansion of the Los Angeles County RMDZ will not have land use plan or policy impacts. The RMDZ program does not supersede any current land use policies or regulations. Therefore, it will be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls. Projects that apply for assistance through the RMDZ are required to be in compliance with all land use policies and regulations in order to qualify for assistance.

The following sections provide detailed explanations for each response in the "Environmental Checklist Form."

#### I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

##### a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project consists of expanding the Los Angeles County RMDZ. The RMDZ is an economic and technical assistance program which assists manufacturers and processors within the RMDZ. The expanded Los Angeles County RMDZ will encompass the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and the cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, Vernon, Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance. The project would not have an adverse effect on any scenic vistas. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- b) ***Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?***

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not damage scenic resources. No construction or development is proposed and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- c) ***Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?***

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not degrade nor change the visual quality throughout the Los Angeles County RMDZ. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- d) ***Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?***

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not create any new sources of light or glare. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

## II. **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – Would the project:**

- a) ***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 nonagricultural use?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not change any land uses.

- b) ***Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?***

**No impact.** The RMDZ Program encourages the expansion and location of recycling based manufacturing and reuse business in areas with compatible existing land use. Compatible land uses included commercial/industrial activities. Current Agricultural zoning prohibits such operations on agriculturally zone land. The proposed project would not conflict with any zoning for agricultural use or any Williamson Act contracts in the project area.

- c) ***Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use?***

**No impact.** No construction or change in use is proposed and the proposed project would not involve any changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use.

III. **AIR QUALITY – Would the project:**

- a) ***Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development would be subject to environmental review.

- b) ***Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not violate any air quality standards or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review. The program would not directly affect air quality or increase the production of greenhouse gases within the RMDZ. However, indirectly, air quality could be enhanced by the reduction in transportation of materials to distant markets.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- d) ***Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. No construction or development is proposed, and

any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

e) ***Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not create objectionable odors. Any RMDZ activity that may create objectionable odors would be subject to environmental review.

IV. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

a) ***Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not have an adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

b) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not have an adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Los Angeles County RMDZ substantially consists of densely developed urban areas. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not have an adverse effect on any Federally protected wetlands through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No construction or development is proposed,

and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- d) ***Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- e) ***Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other applicable local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

V. **CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

- a) ***Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. No physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of any historical resource or its immediate surroundings is proposed.

- b-d) ***Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique***

***geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or disturb any human remains. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:**

**a) *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***

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

**ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?***

**iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?***

**iv) *Landslides?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides.

No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review and applicable building codes and construction standards.

**b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse due to soil instability. No construction or development is proposed, and any

construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review and applicable building codes and construction standards.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not create risks to life or property due to expansive soil. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review and applicable building codes and construction standards.

- e) ***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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not generate waste water or involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

VII. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:**

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Any RMDZ projects which require the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials would be subject to environmental review.

- b-c) ***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 or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or wastes within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not 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 or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or wastes within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Any RMDZ project that may release hazardous materials or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or wastes

within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school would be subject to environmental review.

- d) ***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?***

**No impact.** No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- e) ***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 area?***

**No impact.** Los Angeles County RMDZ currently encompasses all the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County as well as the cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, and Vernon. The proposed expanded RMDZ will also include the cities of Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance. Several small public airports and several large commercial airports are in and near these areas. The RMDZ would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- f) ***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 area?***

**No impact.** Los Angeles County RMDZ currently encompasses all the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County as well as the cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, and Vernon. The proposed expanded RMDZ will also include the cities of Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance. Several small private airports and several large commercial airports are in and near these areas. The RMDZ would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- g) ***Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

**No impact.** The expansion of the Los Angeles County RMDZ would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency

response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:**

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No construction or development is proposed and any RMDZ projects would be subject to environmental review.

- b) 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)?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not 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, since the project would not involve the use of any substantial amounts of water. Any RMDZ projects that would require water in substantial amounts would be subject to environmental review.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site since the project would not include activities that would change existing drainage patterns. Any RMDZ project that required construction or development would be subject to environmental review.

- d) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern or increase the rate of runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site on any property. Any RMDZ project that would require construction or development would be subject to environmental review.

- e) ***Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. No construction or development is proposed, and any RMDZ project that may impact stormwater or runoff would be subject to environmental review.

- f) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not otherwise degrade water quality. No construction or development is proposed, and any RMDZ project that may degrade water quality would be subject to environmental review.

- g) ***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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project does not involve any construction or placement of housing.

- h) ***Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

**No impact.** The proposed project does not involve any construction or placement of structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not include activities that could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

**j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not include activities that could expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:**

**a) *Physically divide an established community?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

**b) *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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No construction or change in use is proposed, and any RMDZ project would be subject to environmental review.

**c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No construction or change in use is proposed, and any RMDZ project would be subject to environmental review.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

**a) *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state.

- b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not 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.

**XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:**

- a) *Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the County general plan, the County noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. No construction or change in use is proposed, and any RMDZ project that may expose persons to or generation of such noise levels would be subject to environmental review.

- b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No construction or change in use is proposed, and any RMDZ project that may expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration would be subject to environmental review.

- c-d) *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project or a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project or a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Any RMDZ project that may lead to increase in the ambient noise levels would be subject to environmental review.

- e-f) ***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 area to excessive noise levels or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

**No impact.** Los Angeles County RMDZ currently encompasses the unincorporated areas of the County along with the cities of Burbank, Carson, Commerce, El Monte, Glendale, South Gate, and Vernon. The proposed expanded zone will also include the cities of Compton, Inglewood, Palmdale, and Torrance. There are several public, private, and commercial airports in the area. Any RMDZ project that may expose people to excessive noise levels would be subject to environmental review.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:**

- a) ***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)?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- b-c) ***Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not displace existing housing or people. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE – Would the project:**

- a) ***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, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in the provision of or need for any new or physically altered fire protection, police protection, school, park, or other public facilities. No construction or change in use is proposed, and any RMDZ project which may require additional public facilities would be subject to environmental review.

**XIV. RECREATION – Would the project:**

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities.

- b) ***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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC–Would the project:**

- a) ***Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections. Any RMDZ project that may result in increased traffic loads would be subject to environmental review.

- b) ***Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways. The County's Congestion Management Program (CMP) applies to projects that have the potential to generate a minimum of 50 vehicle trips through a CMP intersection. The proposed project does not have the potential to generate 50 or more trips through a CMP intersection. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- c) ***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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. Any construction or development resulting from an RMDZ project that may result in such hazards would be subject to environmental review.

- e) ***Result in inadequate emergency access?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access since no changes in emergency access would occur as a result of the project. Any construction or development resulting from an RMDZ project that may result in inadequate emergency access would be subject to environmental review.

- f) ***Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in inadequate parking capacity. The project would not increase the need for parking nor result in any changes to existing parking. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:**

- a) ***Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board since the project would not result in contamination of, or increase in, discharge of wastewater. No construction or development is proposed, and any RMDZ

project that may exceed wastewater treatment requirements would be subject to environmental review.

- b) ***Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Any RMDZ project that may cause increased water usage or discharge of wastewater would be subject to environmental review.

- c) ***Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The proposed project would not increase any storm water runoff that would affect existing or planned storm water drainage systems. No construction or development is proposed, and any RMDZ project that may require the construction or expansion of existing facilities would be subject to environmental review.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not necessitate any water supplies to serve the project from any existing entitlements and resources, nor necessitate any new or expanded entitlements. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

- e) ***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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in any capacity determinations made by any wastewater treatment provider since the project would not increase any waste water discharges. Any RMDZ project that may cause increased demand would be subject to environmental review.

- f-g) ***Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would be served by landfills with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No construction or development is proposed, and any construction or development resulting from RMDZ activities would be subject to environmental review.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -**

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.

- c) ***Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. No construction is proposed, and any RMDZ project that could potentially have substantial adverse effects would be subject to environmental review.