SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Recitals Adopting Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Flare Capacity Expansion Project

WHEREAS, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), it is necessary that the South Coast CAQMD prepare Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093, respectively, regarding potentially significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report that cannot be mitigated to insignificance for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Flare Capacity Expansion Project; and

WHEREAS, Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations have been prepared for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Flare Capacity Expansion Project and are included in Attachment 1, which is attached and incorporated herein by reference;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Executive Officer adopts the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Flare Capacity Expansion Project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093, respectively, as required by CEQA and which are included in Attachment 1 hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

02/25/2026
Date:

Signature: _____
Wayne Nastri
Executive Officer
South Coast Air Quality Management District

_____
Approved as to form, Josephine Lee
Principal Deputy District Counsel

SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Attachment 1: Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Flare Capacity Expansion Project

February 2026

State Clearinghouse No. 1992041053
(Formerly State Clearinghouse No. 92041053)

Executive Officer
Wayne Nastri

Deputy Executive Officer
Planning, Rule Development and Area Sources
Sarah Rees, Ph.D.

Assistant Deputy Executive Officer
Planning, Rule Development and Implementation
Michael Krause

Assistant Deputy Executive Officer
Planning, Rule Development and Implementation
Ian MacMillan

Prepared by:

Sina Taghvaee, Ph.D.	Air Quality Specialist
Kevin Ni	Program Supervisor

Reviewed By:

Barbara Radlein	Planning and Rules Manager
Nicholas Dwyer	Senior Deputy District Counsel
Barbara Baird	Chief Deputy Counsel

SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD

CHAIR: MICHAEL A. CACCIOTTI
Councilmember, South Pasadena
Cities of Los Angeles County/Eastern Region

VICE CHAIR: LARRY MCCALLON
Councilmember, Highland
Cities of San Bernardino County

MEMBERS:

VANESSA DELGADO
Senator (Ret.)
Senate Rules Committee Appointee

CURT HAGMAN
Supervisor, Fourth District
County of San Bernardino

PATRICIA LOCK DAWSON
Mayor, Riverside
Cities of Riverside County Representative

HOLLY J. MITCHELL
Supervisor, Second District
County of Los Angeles

JANET NGUYEN
Supervisor, First District
County of Orange

BRENDA OLMOS
Vice Mayor, City of Paramount
Cities of Los Angeles County/Western Region

VERONICA PADILLA-CAMPOS
Speaker of the Assembly Appointee

V. MANUEL PEREZ
Supervisor, Fourth District
County of Riverside

NITHYA RAMAN
Councilmember, Fourth District
City of Los Angeles Representative

CARLOS RODRIGUEZ
Mayor, Yorba Linda
Cities of Orange County

CEDRIC JAMIE RUTLAND, MD FCCP
Governor's Appointee

EXECUTIVE OFFICER:
WAYNE NASTRI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Sunshine Canyon Landfill Flare Capacity Expansion Project is considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). [Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.]. Specifically, CEQA requires: 1) the potential adverse environmental impacts of proposed projects to be evaluated; and 2) feasible methods to reduce or avoid any identified significant adverse environmental impacts of these projects to also be evaluated. CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 defines "feasible" as "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors."

Sunshine Canyon Landfill (SCL) is a Class III landfill (i.e., a municipal landfill that is not authorized to accept hazardous waste). The SCL facility is located at 14747 San Fernando Road, Sylmar, CA 91342, in Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles, which is within the jurisdiction of South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD). SCL operates pursuant to a Title V permit issued by South Coast AQMD in 2018 under Facility ID # 49111. SCL is owned and operated by Browning-Ferris Industries of California, Inc. (BFIC).

The Sunshine Canyon Landfill Flare Capacity Expansion Project (Flare Capacity Expansion Project) aims to further reduce odors at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill and prevent fugitive releases of methane (CH4), which is a potent greenhouse gas (GHG), and toxic air contaminants that are present in landfill gas (LFG) by increasing the flaring capacity of the gas control and collection system to combust the maximum amount of LFG that is estimated to be generated in the future. The applicant seeks modifications to its existing permits to: 1) install and operate two additional LFG flares and two additional 300-horsepower electric blowers; and 2) increase the permitted site-wide LFG combustion limit from 16,100 standard cubic feet per minute (scfm) to 33,334 scfm, corrected to 50 percent CH4 and averaged over 24 hours. No component of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project is expected to expand landfill capacity or increase the amount of waste that can be accepted on a daily, monthly, or annual basis.

The South Coast AQMD has the greatest responsibility for carrying out or approving the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as a whole, which may have a significant effect upon the environment, and is the most appropriate public agency to act as lead agency. [Public Resources Code Section 21067 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15051(b)].[1] The South Coast AQMD, as lead agency, has prepared a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to conduct an environmental review of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Flare Capacity Expansion Project. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152, 15162, and 15385, the SEIR tiers off of and is a subsequent document to the previous Final SEIR for Sunshine Canyon Landfill, which was certified by the City of Los Angeles on December 8, 1999 (referred to herein as the December 1999 Final SEIR).

Prior to the December 1999 Final SEIR, the County of Los Angeles prepared and certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Extension on November 30, 1993 (November 1993 Final EIR), which analyzed the proposed construction and operation of seven new flares, each at 4,167 scfm (corrected to 40% CH4), in addition to the one existing, permitted flare at the SCL facility at that time. The City of Los Angeles, in connection with its

[1] CEQA Guidelines refers to California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.

adoption of a Zone Change and General Plan Amendment that approved landfilling in the City of Los Angeles portion of SCL, then prepared and certified the December 1999 Final SEIR which re-analyzed the previous LFG generation projections in the November 1993 Final EIR and concluded that only five 4,167 scfm flares, instead of eight, were needed. In addition, the air quality analysis in the December 1999 Final SEIR assumed a maximum site-wide LFG flow of 20,835 scfm at 40% CH4 (equivalent to 16,100 scfm at 50% CH4). The facility-wide emission limits of 520 pounds per day (lbs/day) carbon monoxide (CO), 535 lbs/day sulfur oxides (SOx) and 125 lbs/day volatile organic compounds (VOC) were the LFG combustion emission values disclosed in "Table 4.2-1~~5~~8 (Revised)" of the December 1999 Final SEIR. The total LFG combustion flow and associated emission levels analyzed in the December 1999 Final SEIR later became the basis for the permit conditions and site-wide LFG combustion limit in the Title V permit that was issued by the South Coast AQMD in 2018. The December 1999 Final SEIR concluded that the revised project would have potentially significant adverse environmental impacts. Mitigation measures were included as a condition of approval of the project. Findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 were also adopted for the December 1999 Final SEIR.

When examining the potential environmental impacts, the analysis revealed that the Flare Capacity Expansion Project contains new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known at the time the December 1999 Final SEIR was certified. [CEQA Guidelines 15162(a)(3)]. In addition, the Flare Capacity Expansion Project will have significant effects that were not previously discussed. [CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3)(A)].

Because the CEQA analysis prepared for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project is a subsequent document to the December 1999 Final SEIR, the baseline is the project previously analyzed in the December 1999 Final SEIR. This subsequent CEQA document, which includes a project description and analysis of potential adverse environmental impacts that could be generated, concluded that the Flare Capacity Expansion Project will have the potential to generate significant and unavoidable adverse air quality impacts during operation because emissions from the two new flares would result in exceedances of the daily air quality significance thresholds for nitrogen oxides (NOx), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM2.5), sulfur oxides (SOx), and carbon monoxide (CO) and that the quantities of these pollutants were greater and more severe than the previously identified significant adverse air quality impacts related to emissions of NOx, SOx, and CO in the December 1999 Final SEIR. In addition, PM2.5 was not previously evaluated in the December 1999 Final SEIR; therefore, operation of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would create a new significant adverse air quality impact related to PM2.5 emissions.

The SEIR also concluded that the combined construction and operational phases of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project will have the potential to generate significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emission (GHG) impacts because the GHGs would exceed the South Coast AQMD annual significance threshold. GHGs were not previously evaluated in the December 1999 Final SEIR; therefore, operation of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would create a new significant adverse GHG emissions impact. Although the analysis in the SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project concluded that the increase in potential GHG emissions from the two new flares would be significant, the two new flares would serve a beneficial purpose by destroying CH4, a potent GHG found in LFG. The South Coast AQMD has determined that combusting LFG via

flare technology is capable of reducing GHG emissions in terms of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO2e) by approximately 80 percent compared to releasing uncombusted LFG to the atmosphere

The Draft SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project was circulated for a 45-day public review and comment period from September 30, 2025 to November 14, 2025. Four comment letters were received during the comment period and two of these letters were from public agencies, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and CalRecycle. None of the comment letters identified other potentially significant adverse impacts from the Flare Capacity Expansion Project that should be analyzed and mitigated in the Draft SEIR.

Some modifications have been made to the Draft SEIR to make it a Final SEIR. The comments and responses relative to the Draft SEIR are included in Appendix F of the Final SEIR. South Coast AQMD evaluated the modifications made to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project after the release of the Draft SEIR for public review and comment and concluded that none of the revisions constitute significant new information, because: 1) no new significant environmental impacts would result from the proposed project; 2) there is no substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact; 3) no other feasible project alternative or mitigation measure was identified that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project and was considerably different from others previously analyzed, and 4) the Draft SEIR did not deprive the public from meaningful review and comment. In addition, revisions to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project in response to the comment letters would not create new, unavoidable significant effects. As a result, these revisions do not require recirculation of the Draft SEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Therefore, the Draft SEIR has been revised to include the aforementioned modifications such that it is now the Final SEIR.

In addition, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092.5 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b), South Coast AQMD provided written responses to the comments received from the two public agencies on December 16, 2026, which is more than 10 days prior to the certification date of the Final SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project.

When considering for approval a proposed project that has one or more significant adverse environmental effects, a public agency must make one or more written findings for each significant adverse effect, accompanied by a brief rationale for each finding. [Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15065 and 15091]. The analysis in the Final SEIR concluded that the Flare Capacity Expansion Project has the potential to generate significant adverse air quality impacts during operation, and GHG emission impacts which are more severe or new regional impacts than what was previously analyzed in the December 1999 Final SEIR.

For a proposed project with significant adverse environmental impacts, CEQA requires the lead agency to balance the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its significant unavoidable environmental impacts when determining whether to approve the proposed project. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a), "If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable significant adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered 'acceptable.'" Thus, in addition to making Findings, the lead agency must also adopt a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" to approve a proposed project with significant adverse environmental effects.

2.0 CEQA PROVISIONS REGARDING FINDINGS

CEQA generally requires agencies to make certain written findings before approving a proposed project with significant environmental impacts. Relative to making Findings, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

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

2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

(b) The findings required by subsection (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

(d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

(e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

The "changes or alterations" referred to in CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15370, including:

(a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.

(b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

(c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.

(d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.

(e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

3.0 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In 2016, the South Coast AQMD Hearing Board issued BFIC a Stipulated Order for Abatement (SOA) which required BFIC to address alleged violations of Health and Safety Code Section 41700 and South Coast AQMD Rule 402 - Nuisance relating to landfill odors at the SCL facility. The odors were believed to be caused, in part, by fugitive emissions of LFG that were eluding the LFG collection and control system (GCCS) and instead, were being released directly to the atmosphere through the landfill surface. To reduce fugitive LFG emissions and mitigate odors, the SOA required SCL's operators to implement the following measures: 1) apply alternative daily cover (i.e., non-earthen material) in lieu of nine inches of compacted soil at the working face of the landfill; 2) place additional, intermediate cover materials on selected areas of the site; and 3) install additional LFG collection wells, collectors, and piping to deliver more LFG for combustion. Combustion of LFG destroys most of the odorous compounds, toxic air contaminants (TACs), and CH4 (a potent GHG) present in LFG.

SCL implemented the measures required by the 2016 SOA, which resulted in the collection and combustion of LFG in greater quantities than the current permitted site-wide limit of 16,100 scfm (at 50% CH4). For example, from September 2017 through November 2023, the average quantity of collected and combusted LFG ranged from 12,500 scfm to 17,800 scfm (at 50% CH4, averaged monthly). Moreover, BFIC forecasts that the LFG generation rate at SCL will continue to increase until at least 2038, which is the year that SCL is estimated to stop accepting waste. By 2038, the peak LFG generation rate is predicted to reach 32,392 scfm (at 50% CH4) before leveling off and gradually diminishing in subsequent years.

As part of normal landfill operations, SCL has an active landfill GCCS to manage LFG generated by the decomposition of waste. The SCL GCCS is comprised of more than a thousand horizontal and vertical gas extraction wells, which are interconnected to 12 electric blowers that create a vacuum capable of pulling the gas through the network of conveyance piping, and routing it to be combusted by five existing LFG flares at SCL that are currently operated by BFIC (Flares 1, 3, 9, 10, and 11). The SCL GCCS also supplies LFG to a separate LFG-to-energy (LFGTE) facility owned and operated by Sunshine Gas Producers, LLC (SGP). The SGP facility is located within the northern portion of SCL property but operates as a separate business entity under Facility ID # 139938. The SGP facility operates five LFGTE turbines, a landfill gas treatment system, and one small auxiliary flare. All of the gas rights at SCL are owned by SGP which means that the LFG collected by the SCL GCCS is first supplied to the SGP facility for electricity production. Surplus LFG that is not used by the SGP facility is routed to and combusted by the SCL flares. The current

site-wide LFG combustion limit of 16,100 scfm (at 50% CH4) applies to the total LFG combusted by the SCL flares and the SGP facility.

To accommodate the additional LFG collected by the GCCS and to continue to adequately control odors in the future, BFIC is now seeking to increase the number of flares from five to seven and to increase the site-wide LFG combustion limit. The Flare Capacity Expansion Project includes the following modifications:

- Install and operate two additional low emission flares (proposed Flares 12 and 13) and two additional 300-hp electric blowers, and connect them to the existing GCCS.
- Increase the site-wide LFG combustion limit from 16,100 scfm to 33,334 scfm (at 50% CH4, averaged over 24 hours).

The increase in the new site-wide LFG combustion limit of 33,334 scfm (at 50% CH4) represents the combined design capacity of the five existing flares plus two proposed flares, and is slightly higher than the 2038 forecasted LFG generation rate at SCL (32,392 scfm [at 50% CH4]).

The analysis in the Final SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project assumed that the five existing flares plus the two new flares would operate continuously at the new site-wide combustion limit of 33,334 scfm (at 50% CH4). This assumption is conservative because the SCL flares would only operate at their maximum capacities when the SGP facility is temporarily offline (e.g., planned shutdowns twice a year that last up to five days for conducting maintenance and repairs). The SGP facility was not evaluated in the Final SEIR because the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would not include any physical or operational modifications to the SGP facility.

4.0 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH CANNOT BE REDUCED BELOW A SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The analysis in the Final SEIR independently considered whether the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would result in new significant impacts for any environmental topic areas previously concluded in the December 1999 Final SEIR to have either no significant impacts or less than significant impacts. The Final SEIR identified the topics of operational air quality and GHG emissions, as the areas in which the Flare Capacity Expansion Project may cause significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. No other significant adverse impacts were identified. The following discussions consider the Flare Capacity Expansion Project and analyze the incremental changes for operational air quality and GHG emissions, relative to the baseline, which is the project analyzed in the December 1999 Final SEIR and which was comprised of five flares, each at 4,167 scfm (corrected to 40% CH4), and a maximum site-wide LFG flow of 20,835 scfm at 40% CH4 (equivalent to 16,100 scfm at 50% CH4). The calculated emission increments represent the maximum potential flare emissions for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project minus the emissions associated with the quantity of historical LFG collected and combusted between September 2017 and November 2023 which, due to the greater quantity of LFG captured than originally expected, is approximated as the maximum potential flare emissions baseline established in the December 1999 Final SEIR.

A. Air Quality Impacts During Operation

The Flare Capacity Expansion Project would involve: 1) the continued operation of the five existing flares (Flares 1, 3, 9, 10, and 11) but with an increased LFG combustion rate; and 2) the operation of two new flares (Flares 12 and 13) at SCL. Table 4-7 from the Final SEIR presents the project proponent's request criteria pollutant emission limits for all seven flares. The emission limits reflect all flares operating at their maximum LFG input capacities, which total 33,334 scfm (at 50% CH4). The analysis in the Final SEIR assumed that all seven flares would operate continuously at the requested maximum emission limits even though in practice a substantial portion of the collected LFG would be diverted to the SGP facility except when the SGP facility is temporarily off-line. When online, the SGP facility is capable of combusting approximately 10,000 scfm of LFG at 50% CH4.

The requested emission limits for Flares 1, 3, 9, 10, and 11 as presented in Table 4-7 of the Final SEIR are the same as the current Title V emission limits for the individual flares as presented in Table 3-4 of the Final SEIR. The emission limits for new Flares 12 and 13 were developed by South Coast AQMD engineers and reflect a combination of flare design specifications and compliance with Rule 1118.1 – Control of Emissions from Non-Refinery Flares and New Source Review requirements set forth in Rule 1303 – Requirements.

Table 4-7 (from the Final SEIR)
Maximum Potential Criteria Pollutant Emissions
Associated with Proposed Project Operation

Abatement Device	Rated LFG Input (scfm)	Rated Heat Input (MMBtu/hr) [2]	Proposed Permit Emission Limit (lb/day) [1]					
			NOx	VOC	PM10	PM2.5 [4]	SOx	CO
Flare 1	4,167	117	174.0	23.0	41.0	41.0	107.0	104.0
Flare 3	4,167	117	144.0	15.1	38.4	38.4	91.2	98.4
Flare 9	5,000	152	91.2	21.8	36.0	36.0	182.4	218.9
Flare 10	5,000	152	91.2	21.8	36.0	36.0	182.4	218.9
Flare 11	5,000	152	91.2	21.8	36.0	36.0	182.4	218.9
Flare 12 [5]	5,000	152	91.2	21.8	36.0	36.0	103.4	218.9
Flare 13 [5]	5,000	152	91.2	21.8	36.0	36.0	103.4	218.9
Total	**33,334 [3]**	**994**	**774.0**	**147.1**	**259.4**	**259.4**	**952.2**	**1,296.9**

Notes:
[1] There would be no change in the Title V individual flare permit limits for existing Flares 1, 3, 9, 10, and 11. The proposed emission limits for Flares 12 and 13 are draft permit conditions developed by the South Coast AQMD for Flare 12.
[2] The values displayed for rated heat input are based on the higher heating value (HHV). The values for Flares 1 and 3 were converted from lower heating value (LHV) to HHV by dividing by 0.90.
[3] At 50% CH4. This value represents the total capacity of the seven flares.
[4] The PM2.5/PM10 ratio for flares is assumed to be 1.00 (SCAQMD, 2006).
[5] Proposed new flare.

Pursuant to Rule 1303(b)(2), a portion of the NOx, VOC, PM10, and SOx emissions from new Flares 12 and 13 would need to be offset as part of the permitting process. Because SCL's flares are considered an essential public service, the emission offsets would be provided from the South Coast AQMD's internal offset accounts in accordance with Rule

1309.1 – Priority Reserve. Emission offsets would not be applicable for CO since South Coast AQMD is in attainment for CO. Additionally, the permits for Flares 12 and 13 are not expected to have emission increases of PM2.5 greater than the applicability threshold under Rule 1325; therefore, PM2.5 offsets would not be required.

Table 4-8 from the Final SEIR presents the daily criteria pollutant emissions increments associated with flare operation under the Flare Capacity Expansion Project. The increments equal the maximum flare emissions from Table 4-7 minus the baseline flare emissions from Table 3-6 minus the offset emissions. The baseline flare emissions represent the maximum potential flare emissions under the December 1999 Final SEIR, which reflect the five existing flares operating at their most restrictive current Title V permit limits.

Table 4-8 also shows that the incremental increased emissions of VOC and PM10 associated with the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would be less than the daily significance thresholds during operation. Therefore, the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would not produce a new significant regional impact or substantially increase the severity of a previously identified significant regional impact related to the operational emissions of VOC and PM10.

Table 4-8 (from the Final SEIR)
Criteria Pollutant Emissions Increments Associated with Proposed Project Operation

Emissions Scenario	NOx (lb/day)	VOC (lb/day)	PM10 (lb/day)	PM2.5 (lb/day)	SOx (lb/day)	CO (lb/day)
Proposed Project [1]	774.0	147.1	259.4	259.4	952.2	1,296.9
Baseline [2]	408.2	71.3	129.2	129.2	514.4	520.0
Offset Emissions [3]	188.0	46.0	59.0	N/A	150.0	N/A
Emissions Increment [4]	**177.8**	**29.8**	**71.2**	**130.2**	**287.8**	**776.9**
Significance Threshold	55	55	150	55	150	550
Exceeds Threshold?	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**

Notes:
[1] Source: Table 4-7. Total from Flares 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 at capacity.
[2] Source: Table 3-6. Baseline emissions reflect the maximum potential flare emissions under the December 1999 Final SEIR.
[3] Pursuant to Rule 1303(b)(2), the permit units are required to offset a portion of their emissions. The emissions to be offset shown here are for Flares 12 and 13 and are based on the permit evaluation for Flare 12. The same amount is used for Flare 13, as that is assumed to be identical to Flare 12 (although no permit applications have been filed for Flare 13).
[4] Emissions Increment = Proposed Project minus Baseline minus Offset Emissions.

Under the Flare Capacity Expansion Project, the potential increases in operational emissions from the existing flares (Flares 1, 3, 9, 10, and 11) plus the emissions from the two new flares (Flares 12 and 13) would exceed the South Coast AQMD's daily significance threshold for NOx, PM2.5, SOx, and CO. Thus, operational NOx, PM2.5, SOx, and CO impacts are significant for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project.

B. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The South Coast AQMD evaluates GHGs in terms of annual emissions in terms of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO2e) and a significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons (MT) of CO2e per year was adopted for projects where South Coast AQMD is the lead agency. The GHG emissions from the Flare Capacity Expansion Project consist of annual operational emissions plus total construction emissions amortized over 30 years (i.e., total construction emissions divided by 30 years).

Table 4-17 from the Final SEIR presents the total GHG emissions associated with construction of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project. The construction-related GHG emissions would occur over approximately four months. These GHG emissions were estimated using CalEEMod. The main assumptions used in CalEEMod are described in Impact AQ-2 on page 4-14 of the Final SEIR. The CalEEMod output for construction-related GHG emissions is included in Appendix D of the Final SEIR. Table 4-17 shows that construction would produce an estimated 795 MT of CO2e. Amortizing construction-related GHG emissions over 30 years results in an amortized annual emission rate of 27 MT per year of CO2e, which is less than the South Coast AQMD air quality significance threshold of 10,000 MT/yr of CO2e for GHGs.

Table 4-17 (from the Final SEIR)
Total GHG Emissions Associated with Proposed Project Construction

Source	CO2 (MT)	CH4 (MT)	N2O (MT)	R (MT) [1]	CO2e (MT) [2]
Construction Equipment	85	0.00	0.00	0.00	85
Trucks	662	0.03	0.10	0.68	695
Worker Vehicles	15	0.00	0.00	0.02	15
Total Emissions	**762**	**0.04**	**0.10**	**0.70**	**795**
Total Emissions Amortized over 30 Years (per year)					**27**

Notes: CO2 = carbon dioxide; CH4 = methane; N2O = nitrous oxide; R = refrigerants; CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalent; MT = metric tons. Emissions were calculated using CalEEMod.
The sum of the displayed values by source may not precisely equal the totals due to rounding.
[1] Refrigerants (some containing HFCs) are fugitive losses from on-board air conditioning and refrigeration systems.
[2] CalEEMod uses 100-year GWPs from IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC, 2007). These GWPs are consistent with the California statewide GHG emissions inventory (CARB, 2023).

Table 4-18 of the Final SEIR presents the maximum potential GHG emissions associated with operation of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project. These GHG emissions reflect the operation of five existing flares plus two new flares at their maximum LFG input capacities, which have a combined total of 33,334 scfm (at 50% CH4). The analysis assumed that all seven flares would operate continuously at maximum capacity even though in practice, a substantial portion of the collected LFG would be diverted to the SGP facility except when the SGP facility is temporarily off-line.

Table 4-18 (of the Final SEIR)
Maximum Potential GHG Emissions Associated with Proposed Project Operation

Abatement Device	LFG Input (scfm) [1]	Annual Emissions (MT/yr)			
		CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Flare 1	4,167	53,368	3.3	0.6	53,642
Flare 3	4,167	53,368	3.3	0.6	53,642
Flare 9	5,000	69,332	4.3	0.8	69,689
Flare 10	5,000	69,332	4.3	0.8	69,689
Flare 11	5,000	69,332	4.3	0.8	69,689
Flare 12 [2]	5,000	69,332	4.3	0.8	69,689
Flare 13 [2]	5,000	69,332	4.3	0.8	69,689
Total	**33,334**	**453,396**	**27.9**	**5.5**	**455,728**

Notes:
[1] At 50% CH4.
[2] Proposed new flare.

Table 4-19 of the Final SEIR presents the annual GHG emissions associated with Flare Capacity Expansion Project during construction and operation (e.g., the sum of the amortized construction emissions from Table 4-17 and the maximum potential operational emissions from Table 4-18) minus the baseline GHG emissions at the time of the December 1999 Final SEIR, which reflect the five existing flares combusting 16,100 scfm (at 50% CH4).

Table 4-19 (of the Final SEIR)
GHG Emissions Increment Associated with
Proposed Project Construction and Operation

Emissions Scenario	CO2e (MT/yr)
Proposed Project Construction [1]	27
Proposed Project Operation [2]	455,728
Proposed Project Total	**455,755**
Baseline [3]	224,103
Emissions Increment [4]	**231,652**
Significance Threshold	10,000
Exceeds Threshold?	**Yes**

Notes: CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalent; MT/yr = metric tons per year.
[1] From Table 4-17. Construction emissions are amortized over 30 years.
[2] From Table 4-18.
[3] From Table 3-9.
[4] Emissions Increment = Proposed Project Total minus Baseline. The emissions increment equals the maximum potential flare emissions under the Proposed Project minus the maximum potential flare emissions under the December 1999 Final SEIR.

The following discussion provides context for the significant GHG emissions impact presented in Table 4-19. The Final SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project

quantified the potential increases in flare GHG combustion emissions due to increasing the site-wide LFG combustion limit from 16,100 scfm to 33,334 scfm (at 50% CH4). The addition of two new flares combined with the increase in the site-wide LFG combustion limit would provide all seven flares the capability to combust the maximum forecasted LFG generation of 32,392 scfm (at 50% CH4), which is predicted to be reached by 2038. As shown in Table 4-19, the resulting potential increases in flare GHG emissions would exceed the South Coast AQMD' air quality significance threshold of 10,000 MT/yr of CO2e for GHGs; thus, the Final SEIR concluded significant GHG emission impacts.

It is important to note that the flares act as abatement devices for minimizing the release of uncombusted GHGs from the LFG in the form of CH4, which is a more potent GHG than CO2 resulting from combustion of LFG. Because CH4 has 25 times the global warming potential (GWP) of CO2, the CO2 created during LFG combustion via flare technology is much less potent than the CH4 that otherwise would have been emitted in fugitive releases of LFG as CH4. Thus, by converting nearly all of the CH4 present in uncombusted LFG into CO2 through flare combustion, reducing CH4 emissions from landfills is one of the best ways to achieve a near-term beneficial impact in mitigating global climate change.

As demonstrated in Table 4-20 of the Final SEIR, the Final SEIR concluded that combusting LFG in flares reduces CO2e emissions by approximately 80 percent compared to releasing the same amount of uncombusted LFG to the atmosphere.

Table 4-20 (from the Final SEIR)
GHG Emissions Benefit from Combusting LFG by Flares

Emission Scenario	Annual Emissions (MT/MMscf) [1,2]			
	CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Uncombusted LFG	25.9	9.4	0	262.1
Flared LFG	52.0	0.002	0.0003	52.1
CO2e Reduction from Flaring LFG				80%

Notes: MT/MMscf = metric tons per million standard cubic feet of LFG.
[1] Assumes LFG is composed of 50% CH4.
[2] Combustion emissions were calculated using emissions factors from 40 CFR Part 98 Subpart C, Tables C-1 and C-2.

Therefore, although the Final SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project concluded that the increases in GHG emissions from the new two flares and the increased site-wide facility limit would be more significant and more severe than what would occur for the project analyzed in the December 1999 Final SEIR, the two new flares would serve a beneficial purpose of destroying CH4 in LFG and prevent the release of uncombusted LFG to the atmosphere.

5.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Public Resources Code Section 21081(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) provide that a public agency shall not approve or carry out a project with significant environmental effects unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Additionally, the findings must be supported by substantial evidence in the record. [CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(b)]. Three potential findings can be made for potentially significant impacts:

Finding 1: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final SEIR. [Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)].

Finding 2: Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. [Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2)].

Finding 3: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR. [Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)].

As identified in the Final SEIR and summarized in Section 4.0 of this document, the Flare Capacity Expansion Project has the potential to create significant adverse impacts for the following environmental topic areas: air quality during operation, and GHG emissions. The South Coast AQMD, therefore, makes the following findings regarding the Flare Capacity Expansion Project. The findings are supported by substantial evidence in the record as explained in each finding. These findings will be included in the record of project approval and will also be noted in the Notice of Determination. The findings made by the South Coast AQMD are based on the following significant adverse impacts identified in the Final SEIR:

A. Potential operational air quality impacts exceed the South Coast AQMD's applicable significance air quality thresholds and cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels.

Findings and Explanation:
The Final SEIR concluded that the Flare Capacity Expansion Project will have the potential to generate significant and unavoidable adverse air quality impacts during operation because the emissions from the two new flares would result in exceedances of the daily significance thresholds for NOx, PM2.5, SOx, and CO. The quantities of NOx, SOx, and CO emissions identified in the December 1999 Final SEIR were also concluded to be significant; therefore, operation of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would increase the severity of previously identified significant air quality impacts related to emissions of NOx, SOx, and CO. In addition, PM2.5 was not previously evaluated in the December

1999 Final SEIR; therefore, operation of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would create a new significant regional impact related to PM2.5.

All existing and new flares would be included in the revised Title V permit which will be issued and enforced by the South Coast AQMD. The flares would be required to comply with all applicable South Coast AQMD rules, including Best Available Control Technology (BACT), the requirement to provide emission offsets as set forth in Rule 1303, and emission limits as specified in Rule 1118.1, in addition to applicable state and federal regulations. Moreover, the flares themselves are considered abatement devices that destroy CH4 (a potent GHG), odors, and TACs which are present in raw LFG. No mitigation measures have been identified that would be feasible to reduce the operational emissions from the flares beyond the existing regulatory requirements applicable to this equipment.

The Executive Officer finds that: 1) the potential NOx, PM2.5, SOx, and CO emissions from the Flare Capacity Expansion Project exceed the South Coast AQMD daily significance thresholds for air quality during operation; and 2) there are no feasible mitigation measures that would eliminate or reduce the project-level significant adverse operational air quality impacts for NOx, PM2.5, SOx, and CO emissions to less than significant levels. [Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)].

B. Potential GHG emissions impacts exceed the South Coast AQMD's applicable significance threshold and cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels.

Findings and Explanation:
The Final SEIR concluded that the combined construction and operational phases of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project will have the potential to generate significant and unavoidable GHG emission impacts because the quantity of GHGs would exceed the South Coast AQMD air quality significance threshold for GHGs. While GHG emissions were not previously evaluated in the December 1999 Final SEIR. operation of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would create a new significant regional impact related to GHGs. Although the Final SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project concluded that the increase in potential GHG emissions from flaring LFG relative to the December 1999 Final SEIR would be significant, the five existing flares and two new flares would serve a beneficial purpose of destroying CH4 in LFG. The South Coast AQMD has determined that combusting LFG in flares reduces CO2e emissions by approximately 80 percent compared to releasing the same quantity of LFG to the atmosphere uncombusted.

The Executive Officer finds that: 1) the potential GHG emissions from the Flare Capacity Expansion Project exceed the South Coast AQMD air quality significance threshold for GHG emissions; and 2) while there are no feasible mitigation measures that would eliminate or reduce the project-level significant adverse GHG emissions to less than significant levels, the two new flares would serve a beneficial purpose of combusting LFG in flares thereby reducing CO2e emissions by approximately 80 percent compared to releasing the same quantities of LFG to the atmosphere uncombusted. [Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)].

5.1 FINDINGS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO THE FLARE CAPACITY EXPANSION PROJECT

The rationale for selecting specific components of the Proposed Project on which to focus the alternatives analysis rests on CEQA's requirements to present a range of reasonable project alternatives that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project, while generating fewer or less severe adverse environmental impacts. The Project Objectives are as follows:

1. Increase the site-wide LFG combustion flare capacity and permit limit to accommodate the LFG currently being produced and collected and to accommodate the maximum future projected LFG production rate.
2. Increase the capacity of the GCCS to accommodate the maximum future projected LFG production rate.
3. Further reduce landfill odors and prevent fugitive releases of CH4, which is a potent GHG, and TACs that are present in LFG.

The range of feasible alternatives selected for analysis was limited by the nature of the Proposed Project, its objectives and associated legal and regulatory requirements. For example, South Coast AQMD Rule 1150.1 states that "the gas collection and gas control systems shall be designed to handle the maximum expected gas flow rate from the entire area of the MSW landfill that requires control." Rule 1150.1 also states that the GCCS must "route all collected landfill gas to a gas control system designed to be operated continuously to reduce methane by at least 99 percent by weight…" Therefore, any feasible alternative would need to meet the project objectives as well as the legal and regulatory requirements.

A. Alternative A: No Project Alternative

Finding and Explanation:
The Final SEIR analyzed a No Project Alternative, referred to as Alternative A, which consists of what would occur if the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed is not approved. No construction would occur and the existing GCCS, flaring system, and site wide combustion limit would remain in effect. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing GCCS would continue to operate at its current LFG extraction capability, using 12 existing electric blowers to apply vacuum to the extraction wells and to direct LFG to the combustion devices. The five existing flares (Flares 1, 3, 9, 10, and 11) would continue to operate pursuant to the 2018 Title V permit, which has a site-wide LFG combustion limit of 16,100 scfm (at 50% CH4). This alternative would not meet any of the three project objectives for the following reasons:

The quantity of LFG collected and combusted by the existing SCL flares and SGP facility has already exceeded the current site-wide combustion limit of 16,100 scfm (at 50% CH4) on multiple occasions since 2017. Therefore, implementing the No Project Alternative, in lieu of the project as proposed, would continue to violate the 2018 Title V permit by combusting more site-wide LFG than is permitted. In addition, as the future LFG generation rate at SCL continues to increase over time, the quantity of LFG would eventually exceed the LFG extraction capability of the existing GCCS, resulting in substantial fugitive releases of uncombusted LFG through the landfill surface. These

releases would likely result in greater odor impacts, in violation of Rule 402 – Nuisance. Moreover, releasing uncombusted LFG would be primarily comprised of CH4 which is a more potent GHG because it has a GWP at 25 times the GWP of CO2. As previously demonstrated in Table 4-20, the South Coast AQMD has determined that combusting LFG in flares reduces CO2e emissions by approximately 80 percent compared to releasing the same quantity of uncombusted LFG to the atmosphere under the No Project Alternative.

Because Alternative A does not achieve the primary project objectives, Finding 3 is applicable to Alternative A. Therefore, the Executive Officer finds that the No Project Alternative is infeasible. [Public Resources Code 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3); California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1000- 1001 (upholding finding of infeasibility where agency determined alternative failed to achieve project objective)].

B. Alternative B: Additional Backup

Finding and Explanation:
The Final SEIR analyzed Alternative B, which consists of providing additional flaring capability in the event that a SCL flare and the SGP LFGTE facility are concurrently inoperable due to unforeseen circumstances. All other features of Alternative B would be the same as for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed. Specifically, this alternative would:

- Install and operate three new low emission flares and three new 300-hp electric blowers, and connect them to the existing GCCS.
- Revise the Title V permit to increase the site-wide LFG combustion limit from 16,100 scfm to 33,334 scfm (at 50% CH4, averaged over 24 hours).

Compared to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, Alternative B would require more construction activities to install the additional flares, blowers and connections.

Having three new flares and three new electric blowers would provide redundancy in case one or more of the flares and blowers are offline for maintenance or other reasons. This redundancy would help minimize the potential for fugitive LFG releases through the landfill surface. While Alternative B will increase the total number of available flares from five to eight, the sitewide maximum LFG combustion limit of 33,334 scfm for all eight flares combined would remain the same as for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project for seven flares. As a practical matter, under Alternative B, only seven of the eight flares would be operating concurrently. Even though Alternative B would require additional construction and operational maintenance for three new flares, because the total site-wide LFG combustion limit for all eight flares (three new plus five existing) would be the same as for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed for all seven flares (two new plus five existing), this alternative would meet all of the project objectives.

Previously adopted mitigation measures would continue to apply to Alternative B, and, similar to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, no new or modified mitigation measures would reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts under this alternative to less than significant.

Although Alternative B would provide redundancy in the event of unforeseen circumstances, because Alternative B would involve more extensive construction activities from both on-road and off-road construction equipment over a longer period of time than what would occur under for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, result in more emissions of GHGs and diesel particulate matter (DPM), a carcinogenic and chronic TAC during construction, and not change the quantity of emissions of the new flares since only two of the three would be operating, the Executive Officer finds that Alternative B, if implemented in lieu of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project, will not avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects. [Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)].

C. Alternative C: Alternate Onsite Location

Finding and Explanation:
The Final SEIR analyzed Alternative C, which consists of constructing the same components as the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as Proposed, except the two new flares and necessary associated equipment would be installed at a different location within the SCL site. Specifically, at a minimum, this alternative would:

- Install and operate two new low emission flares (proposed Flare 12 and 13) and three new 300-hp electric blowers, and connect them to the existing GCCS.
- Revise the SCL Title V permit to increase the site-wide LFG combustion limit from 16,100 scfm to 33,334 scfm (at 50% CH4, averaged over 24 hours).

However, due to the uncertainty of where the alternate location for the two new flares would be and their distance from this alternate location to the existing GCCS, additional logistical factors need to be considered. For example, installation of the proposed two new flares at a different location within the SCL property would require approximately up to two acres of flat land. As such, the alternate location could potentially require substantial cuts into the slope of the property and slope stabilization as well as the removal of existing trees and vegetation. Access to the two new flares at an alternate location would likely need to be reconfigured, potentially triggering a redesign and expansion of roadways within the property to reach the new alternate location, along with additional clearing of vegetation. From an infrastructure standpoint, installing two new flares at a separate, different on-site location from the existing flares would potentially require: 1) more connective piping covering a longer distance to the existing GCCS; 2) upgrading the existing power supply which could potentially require a new, higher capacity transformer, higher voltage distribution lines, and new or upgraded switchgear; and 3) installing a triple blower skid with three electric blowers. Compared to the proposed project, Alternative C would require three blowers instead of two because the proposed location benefits from existing blower redundancy. In contrast, a stand-alone location under Alternative C lacks shared

infrastructure, necessitating an additional blower to maintain operational reliability. Additionally, although the new flares are designed to withstand wind speeds of up to 110 mph, the alternate on-site location for the two new flares may be more exposed to higher wind conditions. If wind speeds at the selected site exceed this threshold, Alternative C may require additional cutting, grading, or enhanced wind protection measures—such as utilizing the natural hillsides for shielding—to ensure adequate protection for the two new flares.

In concept, relocating the two new flares to another location could avoid clustering the emission plumes from the two new flares with the existing plumes from the three existing flares within the SCL site as a means to potentially reduce or avoid worsening the localized operational air quality impacts (i.e., ambient pollutant concentrations, odors, and health risks). However, selecting an alternate location for the two new flares with the goal of consistently preventing, avoiding or minimizing the overlap of emission plumes from all five flares (two new and three existing) at one location is a theoretical exercise that may not result in actual reductions of localized impacts because the prevailing wind patterns and direction, atmospheric conditions, surface characteristics, topography and other environmental factors could still result in overlapping plumes even if the two new flares are sited in a different location from the existing flares. Additionally, the specific layout and configuration of the alternate location for the two new flares, while at a distance from the location of the other existing flares, could still lead to unforeseen interactions between these multiple emission sources, which may not succeed in fully avoiding the clustering effects. Consequently, the potential benefit, if any, of having fewer localized impacts under Alternative C is uncertain and dependent on conditions that cannot be forecasted.

Even if Alternative C results in fewer maximum localized impacts during operation when compared to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, the localized impacts of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project are already at less than significant levels. Meanwhile, Alternative C is expected to generate larger quantities of construction-related GHG emissions than the Flare Capacity Expansion Project due to the increased construction activities required. As a result, Alternative C would worsen the potentially significant GHG impacts associated with the Flare Capacity Expansion Project.

As with the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, the installation of three new electric blowers under Alternative C would improve the ability of the GCCS to collect LFG, thereby reducing the potential for fugitive releases of LFG. Also, as with the Flare Capacity Expansion Project, the two new flares would increase the total number of active flares at the landfill from five to seven under Alternative C, with a maximum LFG combustion limit of 33,334 scfm for the flares. Under Alternative C, the SCL flares would have enough physical capacity to combust the maximum predicted LFG flow of 32,392 scfm (at 50% CH4) expected by 2038, even when the SGP facility is offline. Thus, Alternative C would meet all of the project objectives.

Previously adopted mitigation measures would continue to apply, and, similar to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project, no new or modified mitigation measures would reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts under this alternative to less than significant.

Although the relocation of the two new flares to another location could avoid clustering the emission plumes from the two new flares with the existing plumes from the three existing flares within the SCL site as a means to potentially reduce or avoid worsening the localized operational air quality impacts, because Alternative C would involve more extensive construction activities from both on-road and off-road construction equipment over a longer period of time than what would occur under the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, result in more emissions of GHGs and diesel particulate matter (DPM), a carcinogenic and chronic TAC during construction, and not change the operational emissions of the two new flares, the Executive Officer finds that Alternative C, if implemented in lieu of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, will not avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects. [Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)].

D. Alternative D: Beneficial Re-Use of LFG

Finding and Explanation:
The Final SEIR analyzes Alternative D, which consists of constructing one new flare according to the specifications in the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, and a LFGTE facility comparable to the existing one currently operated by SGP which operates at a LFG flow rate of approximately 7,500 scfm at 50% CH4, and has a maximum capacity of approximately 10,000 scfm at 50% CH4. The current SGP LFGTE facility operates five LFGTE turbines which are used for equipment estimation. Under Alternative D, a portion of LFG produced at the SCL site, which would otherwise be flared, would be repurposed to generate electricity. All other features would be the same as for the Proposed Project. Specifically, this alternative would:

- Install and operate one new low emission flare, one new 300-hp electric blower, five new LFGTE turbines, and connect them to the existing GCCS.
- Revise the SCL Title V permit to increase the site-wide LFG combustion limit from 16,100 scfm to 28,334 scfm (at 50% CH4, averaged over 24 hours).

Compared to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, Alternative D would have substantially more construction activities due to installing five new turbines in lieu of one flare.

The new flare would increase the number of active flares from five to six at the SCL facility, resulting in a maximum LFG combustion physical capacity of 28,334 scfm for the flares. Under this alternative, SCL would need to rely on the combination of all six flares and the new LFGTE facility to have enough physical capacity to combust the maximum predicted LFG flow of 32,392 scfm (at 50% CH4) expected by 2038, even when the SGP facility is offline. This alternative would meet all of the project objectives.

Previously adopted mitigation measures in the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Summary (MMRS) (see Appendix B of the Final SEIR) would continue to apply, and, similar to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, no new or modified mitigation

measures would reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts under this alternative to less than significant.

Because all landfill gas rights at SCL are owned by SGP, which is a separate legal entity from BFIC and not under BFIC's control, beneficial re-use of LFG under Alternative D is not feasible. **Finding 3 is applicable to Alternative D. Therefore, the Executive Officer finds that Alternative D is infeasible.** [Public Resources Code 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)].

5.2 FINDINGS CONCLUSION

The following contains a summary of the findings:

1) No feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the Final SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project that would eliminate or reduce the significant adverse operational air quality or greenhouse gas emissions impacts to less than significant levels.

2) The Final SEIR considered alternatives pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, but there is no alternative to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, other than Alternative A: No Project Alternative, that would reduce the significant impacts to less than significant levels for all of the aforementioned environmental topic areas. Alternative A was rejected as infeasible because it does not achieve the primary project objectives. [Public Resources Code 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3); California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1000- 1001 (upholding finding of infeasibility where agency determined alternative failed to achieve project objective)].

3) Alternative B: Additional Backup, and Alternative C: Alternate Onsite Location, would involve more extensive construction activities from both on-road and off-road construction equipment over a longer period of time than what would occur under the Proposed Project, result in more emissions of GHGs and diesel particulate matter (DPM), a carcinogenic and chronic TAC during construction, and not change the operational emissions of the proposed flares. The Executive Officer finds that Alternative B and Alternative C, if implemented in lieu of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed, will not avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects. [Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)].

4) Alternative D: Beneficial Re-Use of LFG, was rejected as infeasible because all landfill gas produced at SCL are owned by SGP, which is a separate legal entity from BFIC and not under BFIC's control. [Public Resources Code 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)].

The Executive Officer further finds that the Final SEIR considered alternatives pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, but there is no alternative to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed that would reduce to insignificant levels the significant operational air quality and GHG

emission impacts identified for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project as proposed and still achieve the project objectives.

The Executive Officer further finds that the findings required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) are supported by substantial evidence in the record.

6.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

If significant adverse impacts of a proposed project remain after incorporating mitigation measures, or no measures or alternatives to mitigate the adverse impacts are identified, the lead agency must make a determination that the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects if it is to approve the project. CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. [CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)]. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable" [CEQA Guidelines Section15093(a)]. Accordingly, a Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding potentially significant adverse impacts to air quality from operation and greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the Flare Capacity Expansion Project, has been prepared. This Statement of Overriding Considerations is included as part of the record of the project approval. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(c), the Statement of Overriding Considerations will also be noted in the Notice of Determination for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project.

Despite the inability to incorporate changes into the Flare Capacity Expansion Project that will mitigate potentially significant adverse operational air quality and GHG emission impacts to a level of insignificance, the South Coast AQMD finds that the following benefits and considerations outweigh the potentially significant and unavoidable impacts for the following reasons:

1. In 2016, the South Coast AQMD Hearing Board issued a Stipulated Order of Abatement (SOA) that required BFIC to address excessive landfill odors originating from the SCL facility. BFIC implemented the measures required by the 2016 SOA, which included the installation of additional LFG wells, collectors, and piping to capture and control more LFG. The improvements made to the GCCS in response to the 2016 SOA have resulted in periodic exceedances of the site-wide LFG combustion limit. The Flare Capacity Expansion Project would increase the site-wide LFG combustion flare capacity and permit limit to accommodate the LFG currently being produced and collected and to accommodate the maximum future projected LFG production rate.
2. The analysis of potential adverse environmental impacts assumed that all flares at SCL would operate at their maximum LFG input capacities, which total 33,334 scfm (at 50% CH4). However, in practice, a substantial portion of the collected LFG would be diverted to the SGP LFGTE facility except when the SGP facility is temporarily off-line. When online, the SGP facility is capable of combusting approximately 10,000 scfm of LFG at 50% CH4. As such, this approach likely overestimated the actual adverse environmental impacts from the Flare Capacity Expansion Project.

3. The SCL flares act as abatement devices for GHGs because they convert nearly all of the CH4 present in uncombusted LFG into CO2. Because CH4 has 25 times the GWP of CO2, the CO2 created during LFG combustion is much less potent than the CH4 that otherwise would have been emitted in fugitive LFG releases. The South Coast AQMD has determined that combusting LFG in flares reduces CO2e emissions by approximately 80 percent compared to releasing the same LFG to the atmosphere uncombusted.
4. Although the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would still cause significant adverse impacts to air quality from operation and GHG emissions, it is still considered to provide the best balance in achieving the project objectives while minimizing the significant adverse environmental impacts.

The Executive Officer finds that the above-described considerations outweigh the unavoidable significant effects to the environment as a result of the Flare Capacity Expansion Project.

7.0 MITIGATION

CEQA requires an agency to prepare a plan for reporting and monitoring compliance with the implementation of measures to mitigate significant adverse environmental impacts. When making findings as required by Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, the lead agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment [Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(a)]. The provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 and Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 are triggered when the lead agency certifies a CEQA document in which mitigation measures changes, or alterations have been required or incorporated into the project to avoid or lessen the significance of adverse impacts identified in the CEQA document.

The November 1993 Final EIR and December 1999 Final SEIR resulted in the development of mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts of SCL activities. The Flare Capacity Expansion Project would be required to implement the mitigation measures, where applicable, to reduce potentially significant impacts and ensure compliance with the current Conditional Use Permit (CUP) requirements at the landfill. Specific to air quality, the following SCL Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Summary (MMRS) mitigation measures would apply directly to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project and therefore, were incorporated into the analysis of air quality and GHG emission impacts:

> **MMRS 6.01:** The permittee shall utilize the most effective available technology and methodology to avert fugitive dust emissions. In addition to the revegetation measures required in Condition 41 and in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Summary, the program shall include:
>
> - The permittee shall not engage in any excavation or other operation during high wind conditions (15 minute average wind speed exceeds 15 mph or instantaneous wind speed exceeds 25 mph), or when such conditions may be reasonably expected, that would result in significant emissions of fugitive dust which cannot be confined to the area under the permittee's control.

- Except during rainy conditions, any active area or active cover soil stockpile shall be moistened with water on a daily basis unless wind conditions dictate otherwise, in which case soil sealant shall be used in addition to water.
- All access roads to permanent facilities, except those infrequently used, shall be paved. The paved access road to the fill areas shall be extended as new areas are opened to minimize the length of the dirt road. Winter deck access roads shall be paved or surfaced with recycled asphalt, aggregate materials or soil stabilization products to minimize the length of untreated dirt. All paved roads in regular use are regularly cleaned to remove dirt left by trucks or other vehicles, and at least once daily on operating days.
- The permittee shall install and maintain devices to monitor wind speed and direction, as specified by the South Coast AQMD, and shall retain qualified personnel to read and interpret the data, to obtain or utilize information on predicted wind conditions and to assist in the planning of operations at the Facility.
- The permittee shall submit quarterly reports to the Director of Public Works listing all fugitive dust and odor complaints received from residents and all Notices of Violation issued by the South Coast AQMD or the LEA as well as the measures undertaken to address the complaints and to correct the violations. The Director of Public Works and the Department of Health Services Solid Waste Management Plan (DHS SWMP) shall each have the authority to require the permittee to implement additional corrective measures when such measures are deemed appropriate to protect public health and safety.

MMRS 6.05: The landfill will be operated in accordance with South Coast AQMD Rule 1150.1 and other South Coast AQMD regulations and with applicable Department of Public Works requirements.

MMRS 6.07: Flaring systems shall be sited as required by the South Coast AQMD and constructed using BACT. The flames shall be totally contained within the stack. Flame arrestors shall be provided to the satisfaction of the South Coast AQMD and the County Forester and Fire Warden. The permittee will convert gas, as it is recovered, to a renewable energy resource and to the extent technically and economically feasible.

MMRS 6.09: The following mitigation measures will reduce emissions to the maximum extent reasonably feasible:

- The permittee will maintain equipment in tune per manufacturer's specifications.
- The permittee will use catalytic converters on gasoline-powered equipment.
- The permittee will tune all diesel engines to manufacturer's specifications.
- High-pressure fuel injectors will be installed.
- Heavy equipment will use reformulated, low-emission diesel fuel.
- The permittee will substitute electric and gasoline-powered equipment for diesel-powered equipment where feasible.
- Where applicable, equipment will not be left idling for prolonged periods.

- The permittee will curtail (cease or reduce) construction during periods of high ambient pollutant concentrations (i.e., Stage II smog alerts).

MMRS 7.04: Risks associated with the gas collection and flaring system shall be mitigated through use of flexible piping, flame arrestors, sensors, and automatic shutoff controls. Numerous safety shutdown devices have been designed and installed into the flare station, including a telephone auto-dialer, to provide emergency notification. All gas extraction equipment, including gas condensate and propane tanks, shall be adequately secured to prevent damage during a seismic event. Inspections of the gas collection and flaring system shall be performed after ground-shaking from an earthquake, and necessary action shall be taken to correct any potential problems.

In addition, another mitigation measure, MMRS 7.03 is required to be implemented by SCL to reduce potential impacts from landfill odors. MMRS 7.03 specifically requires an odor/LFG monitoring program for landfill operations. However, since the Flare Capacity Expansion Project would not expand landfill capacity or increase the amount of waste that can be accepted, MMRS 7.03 does not directly apply to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project.

No feasible mitigation measures were further identified for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project that would eliminate or reduce the significant adverse operational air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts to less than significant levels. Since no feasible mitigation measures were identified, modifications to the current MMRS were not required and have not been prepared.

8.0 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For the purposes of CEQA and these Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Record of Proceedings for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project consists of the following documents and other evidence, at a minimum:

- The Final SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project, including appendices and technical studies included or referenced in the Final SEIR, and all other public notices issued by South Coast AQMD for the Final SEIR.
- The Draft SEIR for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project, including appendices and technical studies included or referenced in the Draft SEIR, and all other public notices issued by South Coast AQMD for the Draft SEIR.
- Matters of common knowledge to South Coast AQMD, including but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
- Any documents expressly cited in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations.
- Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).
- The Notice of Determination, and any documents expressly cited the Notice of Determination prepared in compliance with Public Resources Code 21152 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15094.

To comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e), the South Coast AQMD specifies the Deputy Executive Officer of the Planning, Rule Development, and Implementation Division as the custodian of the administrative record for the Flare Capacity Expansion Project, which includes the documents or other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the South Coast AQMD's actions related to the Flare Capacity Expansion Project is based, and which are located at the South Coast AQMD headquarters, 21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, California 91765. Copies of these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been and will be available upon request. This information is provided in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e).