
4.19 Solid Waste

4.19.1 Introduction

The solid waste analysis addresses potential impacts related to municipal and construction solid waste generation and disposal, as more fully described in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR. Technical Report 10, *Solid Waste Technical Report*, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Technical Report S-7, *Supplemental Solid Waste Technical Report*, provides detailed information regarding the solid waste generation factors used in this analysis, as well as additional information on project impacts.

4.19.2 General Approach and Methodology

The analysis of solid waste presented below is based on the general approach and methodology described in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the analysis completed for this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes consideration of changes to baseline conditions (see Section 4.19.3 below). Considerations pertaining to the methodology used in this analysis include the following:

- ◆ Solid waste generation factors were adjusted to reflect 50 percent diversion requirements. Based on this methodology, in the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo-handling activities were forecasted to generate 2.8 pounds of waste per cargo ton per year by 2000. As described in Technical Report S-7, *Supplemental Solid Waste Technical Report* (Section 3), actual cargo-related solid waste disposal at LAX in 2000 achieved the forecasted disposal rate of 2.8 pounds of waste per cargo ton per year.
- ◆ Similarly, in the Draft EIS/EIR, passenger-related activities were forecasted to generate 387 tons per million annual passenger (MAP), or 0.774 pounds per passenger, of solid waste by 2000. Actual passenger-related solid waste disposal at LAX in 2000 was 431 tons per MAP, or 0.862 pounds per passenger.²⁴⁰ For purposes of this analysis, because solid waste generation disposal is expected to continue to decrease and diversion is expected to continue to increase at LAX, the forecasted factor of 387 tons per MAP is still used to project future solid waste generation under each of the alternatives.²⁴¹ A complete discussion of the solid waste generation factors used in this analysis is provided in Technical Report S-7, *Supplemental Solid Waste Technical Report* (Section 3), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.19.3 Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline

The affected environment/environmental baseline related to solid waste used in this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is materially the same as described in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, some of the baseline solid waste generation numbers have been modified to reflect changes in square footage of facilities and to correct errors (refer to **Table S4.19-2**, Summary of Solid Waste Generation in Tons Per Year, in Section 4.19.6 below). A discussion of Year 2000 conditions is provided below. Where appropriate, information current to 2002 is provided.²⁴² No material changes to the affected environment/environmental baseline have occurred that alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Table S4.19-1, Regional Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, provides updated information through the Year 2002, including owner/operator, permitted daily capacity, average daily tonnage in tons per day (tpd), approximate closure date for each of the landfills, and approximate distance from LAX.

²⁴⁰ Los Angeles World Airport, *LAX Waste Characterization & Quantification Study Final Report*, January 2002.

²⁴¹ LAWA, Recycling Coordinator.

²⁴² In some cases, such as for regional landfills' use and capacity, updated information could only be obtained for current conditions as they existed at the time of updating (i.e., 2002 and 2003).

4.19 Solid Waste

Table S4.19-1

Regional Municipal Solid Waste Landfills

Landfill	Owner/Operator	Permitted Daily Capacity (tpd)	Average Daily Tonnage (tpd)	Approx. Closure Date	Approx. Distance From LAX (miles)
Antelope Valley ¹	Arklin Brothers Enterprises, USA Waste	1,400	600	2011 ⁷	67
Bradley West	Waste Management Inc.	10,000	2,200 ⁷	2006 ⁷	30
Calabasas ²	LACSD	3,500	1,100 ⁷	2018	33
Chiquita Canyon ³	Republic Services of California	6,000 ⁷	5,300 ⁷	2011 ⁷	40
Lancaster	Waste Management Inc.	1,700 ⁷	1,200 ⁷	2032 ⁷	82
Puente Hills ⁴	LACSD	12,000	13,200 ⁷	2013 ⁷	31
Scholl Canyon ⁵	LACSD	3,400	1,200	2024 ⁷	32
Sunshine Canyon ⁶	Browning-Ferris Industries	11,500 ⁷	6,500 ⁷	2006 ⁷	82
Total		49,500⁷	31,300⁷		

Note: Table S2, Regional Municipal Waste Landfills, located in Technical Report S7, *Supplemental Solid Waste Technical Report*, provides additional information regarding the regional municipal solid waste landfills within the City of Los Angeles.

- ¹ Antelope Valley Landfill has capacity and is permitted to operate until 2011; however, an expansion anticipated to be permitted by 2004 will extend that service life to 2037.
- ² Calabasas does not accept waste from portions of the City of Los Angeles, including the LAX area.
- ³ Approximately 82 percent of inert waste accepted by Chiquita Canyon originates from the City of Los Angeles.
- ⁴ The County of Los Angeles received a 10-year permit extension for the Puente Hills landfill, extending its service life to 2013. This facility does not accept waste from LAX, as LAX is located outside of its watershed.
- ⁵ Scholl Canyon does not accept waste from the City of Los Angeles.
- ⁶ In 2002, Sunshine Canyon received planning approval to operate an extension within the City of Los Angeles. Though currently not operational, the expansion into the City jurisdiction would extend the service life of the entire facility to 2028. Browning-Ferris Industries has applied for a permit to expand operations in the City of Los Angeles. This application has not received approval from the City of Los Angeles. If approved, the permit would extend the closure date of Sunshine Canyon to 2028.
- ⁷ Modified since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR. This modification does not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Sources: Connie Christian, Project Engineer, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, *Personal Communication*, March 3, 2003; Bruce Matlock, Health & Safety Compliance Supervisor, Waste Management, Inc., *Personal Communication*, October 16, 2002; Larry Mendoza, Solid Waste Systems Administrator, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, *Personal Communication*, January and October, 2002, and March 3, 2003; Matt Terrell, Landfill Manager, Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill, *Personal Communication*, February 4, 2002; Dave Thompson, Environmental Specialist, City of Los Angeles, Environmental Affairs Department, *Personal Communication*, February, 2002, January, 2003, and February 27, 2003; Mike Williams, District Landfill Manager, Waste Management of California, Inc., *Personal Communication*, October, 2002, and March 11, 2003.

- ◆ As indicated in **Table S4.19-1**, the Puente Hills Landfill received a 10-year extension of its operating permit from the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles (LACSD). In addition, LACSD recently purchased Mesquite Regional Landfill in Imperial County to accept municipal waste from Southern California communities via rail haul. A Master Plan will be developed for the Mesquite Regional Landfill and LACSD estimates landfill operations would start by 2010. LACSD recently signed agreements to purchase Eagle Mountain Landfill in Riverside County; however, the purchase agreements have not been finalized and are currently subject to legal challenges.
- ◆ As of December 31, 2000, the remaining permitted Class III (municipal waste) landfill capacity in Los Angeles County was estimated at 96.5 million tons,²⁴³ down from 102.3 million tons in December 1995.²⁴⁴ According to the County, the 96.5 million ton capacity will be exhausted by 2009. Los Angeles County could experience a shortfall in permitted daily capacity as early as 2004 (upon exhaustion of the currently permitted disposal capacity at the Bradley Landfill), even with the development of all in-County landfill expansions, including the proposed Puente Hills and Sunshine Canyon landfill expansions.²⁴⁵

²⁴³ County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, *2000 Annual Report on the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element*, September 2001.

²⁴⁴ Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Environmental Programs Division, *Countywide Siting Element*, June 1997.

²⁴⁵ County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, *2000 Annual Report on the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element*, September 2001.

- ◆ AB 939, also known as the Recycling Act or the California Solid Waste Management Act, required each city and county to divert 50 percent of their waste streams by the year 2000. The City of Los Angeles exceeded the mandated fifty percent diversion rate with a 58.8 percent diversion rate in 2000.²⁴⁶ LAX reached a 67 percent diversion rate by 2000.²⁴⁷ Increased source reduction efforts by airport operations and tenants played a significant factor in reaching the 50 percent diversion rate goal.²⁴⁸
- ◆ As of December 31, 2000, the remaining permitted inert (or unclassified landfill) capacity in Los Angeles County was estimated to be 57.7 million tons. Based on the average 2000 disposal rate, this capacity would be exhausted in approximately 44 years.²⁴⁹ Therefore, there is anticipated to be no shortfall in disposal capacity for inert waste within the county.
- ◆ Changes in conditions between 1996 and 2000 include modifications to cargo, terminal, and ancillary facilities, and acquisition and demolition of 534 dwelling units within Manchester Square and Belford. In addition, passenger and cargo volumes increased by approximately 17 percent and 18 percent, respectively, between 1996 and 2000. These changes resulted in: 1) a decrease in solid waste generation associated with airport facilities by 8,075 tpy, a reduction of 20 percent compared to the 1996 baseline; and 2) a decrease in solid waste generation within the Master Plan boundaries to 32,442 tpy in 2000, a 20 percent reduction compared to the 1996 baseline (refer to **Table S4.19-2**, Summary of Solid Waste Generation in Tons Per Year, in Section 4.19.6 below).
- ◆ In 2000, approximately 23 percent of all materials recycled by LAWA was asphalt and concrete from demolition and repaving operations.²⁵⁰ LAWA recovers, grinds, and recycles concrete and asphalt generated at LAX at an on-site batch plant. As a result of these efforts, LAX achieved a diversion rate of 67 percent in 2000.²⁵¹

4.19.4 Thresholds of Significance

4.19.4.1 **CEQA Thresholds of Significance**

As stated in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.4.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR, a significant solid waste impact would occur if the direct and indirect changes in the environment that may be caused by the particular build alternative would potentially result in one or more of the following future conditions:

- ◆ A net increase in project-related solid waste generation that could not be accommodated by existing or permitted regional landfills or other disposal facilities.
- ◆ Conflicts with solid waste policies and objectives intended to help achieve the requirements of AB 939.

These thresholds are utilized because they address the two potential impacts to solid waste associated with the Master Plan alternatives: the potential for project-generated solid waste to exceed the capacity of permitted regional landfills or other disposal facilities, and the potential for the project to hinder compliance with AB 9393 diversion requirements. The first threshold was developed based upon guidance provided in the *Draft L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*.²⁵² The second threshold was developed specifically to address potential conflicts associated with the requirements of AB 939, which was not addressed in the *Draft L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*.

As indicated in these thresholds, only existing or permitted landfill capacity was considered in this analysis; planned new landfills, landfill expansions, or permit extensions are excluded from the determination of significance. Although there are plans to extend the closure dates for two landfills in the

²⁴⁶ Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), Los Angeles International Airport, Waste Disposal, Recycling and Generation, 2002.

²⁴⁷ Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), Los Angeles International Airport, Waste Disposal, Recycling and Generation, 2002.

²⁴⁸ County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 2000 Annual Report on the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element, September 2001.

²⁴⁹ County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 2000 Annual Report on the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element, September 2001.

²⁵⁰ LAWA, Recycling Coordinator.

²⁵¹ Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), Los Angeles International Airport, Waste Disposal, Recycling and Generation, 2002.

²⁵² City of Los Angeles, Draft L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, May 14, 1998.

4.19 Solid Waste

region, discretionary approval for these facilities is extremely difficult to obtain and may take many years. Other landfills may have reached capacity and, therefore, would not be able to extend their permits.

4.19.4.2 Federal Standards

As stated in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.4.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR, there are no federal standards that define significance thresholds for solid waste impacts. However, the FAA *Airport Environmental Handbook*, requires an evaluation to determine if solid waste disposal facilities (i.e., landfills) are located within 3,000 meters (approximately 9,843 feet) of all runways planned to be used by turbojet aircraft. This is addressed in Section 4.24.3, *Safety*.

4.19.5 Master Plan Commitments

The following Master Plan commitment proposed for solid waste is materially the same as that presented in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.5), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

◆ **SW-1. Implement an Enhanced Recycling Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).**

LAWA will implement a more aggressive recycling program, based on successful programs at other airports and similar facilities. Features of the enhanced recycling program will include: expansion of the existing terminal recycling program to all terminals, including new terminals; development of a recycling program at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside; lease provisions requiring that tenants meet specified diversion goals; and preference for recycled materials during procurement.

The following Master Plan commitments proposed for solid waste are the same as those presented in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.5), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

◆ **SW-2. Requirements for the Use of Recycled Materials During Construction (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).**

LAWA will require that contractors use a specified minimum percentage of recycled materials during construction of LAX Master Plan improvements. The percentage of recycled materials required will be specified in the construction bid documents. Recycled materials may include, but are not limited to, asphalt, drywall, steel, aluminum, ceramic tile, cellulose insulation, and composite engineered wood products. The use of recycled materials in LAX Master Plan construction will help to reduce the project's reliance upon virgin materials and support the recycled materials market, decreasing the quantity of solid waste requiring disposal.

◆ **SW-3. Requirements for the Recycling of Construction and Demolition Waste (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).**

LAWA will require that contractors recycle a specified minimum percentage of waste materials generated during construction and demolition. The percentage of waste materials required to be recycled will be specified in the construction bid documents. Waste materials to be recycled may include, but are not limited to, asphalt, concrete, drywall, steel, aluminum, ceramic tile, and architectural details.

4.19.6 Environmental Consequences

The environmental impacts to solid waste under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C have not materially changed from those described in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, some of the solid waste generation numbers have been modified since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR to reflect changes in square footage and correct errors (see **Table S4.19-2** below). These modifications do not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR. **Table S4.19-2** identifies solid waste generation under each of the alternatives as well as under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. **Table S4.19-3**, Summary of Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Generation, identifies solid waste generation as a result of construction and demolition of Alternatives A, B, C, and D from start through 2015.

Table S4.19-2

Summary of Solid Waste Generation in Tons Per Year

	1996 Baseline	Year 2000	Alternatives 2015				
			NA/NP	A	B	C	D
LAX							
Airport Facilities	40,228	32,153	34,825 ⁸	43,728	43,728	40,516	34,902
Belford	535	281	NA ¹	NA ²	NA ²	NA ²	NA ¹
Continental City	NA	NA	2,964	NA	NA	NA	NA
LAX Northside ⁹	NA	8	5,389	NA	NA	NA	5,389
Westchester Southside	NA	NA	NA ⁸	3,633	3,633	3,633	NA
Subtotal LAX³	40,763	32,442	43,178	47,361	47,361	44,149	40,291
Non-Project Uses Within the Master Plan Boundaries⁴							
Manchester Square	1,947	1,468	NA	3,162 ⁵	NA ⁶	NA ⁶	NA ⁶
Land Within Acquisition Areas ⁷	10,044	9,053	9,053 ⁸	2,006	371	4,853 ⁸	8,221
Subtotal Non-Project Uses³	11,991	10,521	9,053⁸	5,168	371	4,853⁸	8,221
TOTAL MASTER PLAN BOUNDARIES³	52,754	42,963	52,231⁸	52,529	47,732	49,002⁸	48,512

NA = Not Applicable

Note: Information in the table may not always total, due to rounding.

- ¹ Under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D, existing uses would be demolished. No redevelopment is assumed for purposes of this analysis.
- ² Under Alternatives A, B, and C, existing uses within Belford would be demolished, and the area would be incorporated into the overall Master Plan development. Solid waste generation associated with proposed land uses in this area is incorporated within "Airport Facilities" above.
- ³ Information in table may not total due to rounding.
- ⁴ For purposes of this analysis, a single composite study area was established, referred to as the "Master Plan boundaries." However, for each alternative, a portion of the study area would not be incorporated into the Master Plan development.
- ⁵ Under Alternative A, Manchester Square is assumed to be redeveloped with commercial/light industrial uses independent of the Master Plan.
- ⁶ Under Alternatives B, C, and D, existing uses within Manchester Square would be demolished, and the area would be incorporated into the overall Master Plan development. Solid waste generation associated with proposed land uses in this area is incorporated within "Airport Facilities" above.
- ⁷ No land within the acquisition areas would be acquired under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Only a portion of the land within the acquisition areas would be acquired for each build alternative. The land within the areas that would not be acquired would not be affected by the Master Plan and would remain in its current use.
- ⁸ Modified since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR to correct an error in the Draft EIS/EIR. This modification does not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR.
- ⁹ LAX Northside is currently subject to a trip cap (refer to Chapter 4, *Affected Environment, Consequences and Mitigation Measures* (Analytical Framework Section)), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Under Alternative D, this trip cap would be reduced, which would effectively reduce the total amount of development allowed in LAX Northside. Therefore, solid waste generation in this area may be overstated.

Source: Camp Dresser & McKee Inc., 2003.

4.19 Solid Waste

Table S4.19-3

Summary of Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Generation

	Alternative				
	NA/NP	A	B	C	D
Total Construction Solid Waste (Tons)	33,861 ¹	77,540 ¹	69,482 ¹	51,338 ¹	34,165
Total Demolition Solid Waste (Tons)	15,624 ¹	386,352 ¹	493,718 ¹	218,756 ¹	100,178

Notes: Information in the table depicts total waste generation from start through 2015.

¹ Modified since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR to correct an error in the Draft EIS/EIR. This modification does not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Source: Camp Dresser & McKee Inc., 2003.

4.19.6.1 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

A complete description of the facilities associated with Alternative D is provided in Chapter 3, *Alternatives* (subsection 3.3.2), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The features of Alternative D that are relevant to the analysis of solid waste are summarized herein. Under Alternative D, passenger and cargo activity would increase at LAX compared to baseline conditions. Alternative D would include the development of LAX Northside. Existing uses in the acquisition areas would be demolished. As with Alternatives A, B, and C, uses within the ANMP properties (Belford and Manchester Square) will be demolished as part of a separate action being undertaken by LAWA. For purposes of this analysis, no redevelopment of the Belford property is assumed. The land within the acquisition areas and Manchester Square would be incorporated into the Master Plan.

Table S4.19-2 shows that, under Alternative D, solid waste generation for airport facilities would decrease 5,326 tpy below baseline conditions by 2015 (a 13 percent decrease). LAX Northside solid waste generation would be 5,389 tpy by 2015. Total solid waste generation within the Master Plan boundaries under Alternative D would decrease by 4,242 tpy below baseline conditions by 2015 (a 8 percent decrease).

Although total solid waste generation would decrease as compared to 1996 baseline conditions under Alternative D, it would increase by 13 percent compared to Year 2000 conditions.

Under Alternative D, solid waste generation for airport-related land uses would be slightly higher than the No Action/No Project Alternative. However, overall solid waste generation within the Master Plan boundaries would be lower than the No Action/No Project Alternative.

The decrease in solid waste generation as compared to the environmental baseline is partly due to the ongoing acquisition and demolition of existing land uses within Belford and Manchester Square and the planned acquisition of additional land for Master Plan development, and partly due to compliance with AB939 diversion requirements, including the LAX on-site recycling program and participation in the city's diversion program. The development of LAX Northside and the increase in passengers and cargo tonnage would partially offset this decrease. Overall solid waste generation would decrease as compared to baseline conditions. Because solid waste generation within the Master Plan boundaries is projected to decrease under Alternative D, the impact would be less than significant.

In addition to existing programs aimed at reducing solid waste generation, LAWA would implement Master Plan Commitment SW-1, Implement an Enhanced Recycling Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), to enhance the current on-site recycling program, extend recycling requirements to tenants, and address the procurement of recycled materials. With the continuation of existing recycling programs and implementation of Master Plan Commitment SW-1, Implement an Enhanced Recycling Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), Alternative D would not conflict with solid waste policies and objectives intended to help achieve the requirements of AB 939.

Construction and demolition activities for Alternative D would generate a substantial amount of solid waste requiring disposal. **Table S4.19-3** shows solid waste generation projections for this alternative. As

indicated in the table, under Alternative D, overall solid waste due to demolition would total 100,178 tons by 2015. Total solid waste due to new construction would total 34,165 tons by 2015.

For cargo and terminal buildings, construction waste would consist primarily of masonry, concrete, and metal. These materials are fairly easily recycled and a sizable market for their recycling exists. These materials also tend to create fewer scraps during construction than do materials like wood or drywall. Construction and demolition activities would also require the removal of pavement. LAX uses recycled pavement as filler below new paving. To the extent possible, suitable materials would be reused at LAX. Additionally, Master Plan Commitments SW-2, Requirements for the Use of Recycled Materials During Construction (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), and SW-3, Requirements for the Recycling of Construction and Demolition Waste (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), would reduce the amount of demolition and construction waste requiring disposal by requiring contractors to use recycled construction materials and to recycled demolition and construction-related waste.

Inert disposal capacity is anticipated to be available well beyond the 2015 planning horizon. Therefore, impacts with respect to construction and demolition solid waste associated with Alternative D would be less than significant.

4.19.7 Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts to solid waste associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, or C, in combination with other past, present, and probable future projects, have not changed from those described in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.7), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.19.7.1 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

Although airport activities would increase under Alternative D, with the acquisition and demolition of land uses within the Master Plan boundaries, and compliance with AB 939, total solid waste generated within the Master Plan boundaries would decrease as compared to the 1996 environmental baseline. As a result, impacts relative to solid waste generation would be less than significant. Alternative D would not have indirect effects on solid waste, as both on-airport and off-airport direct employment is projected to decrease, resulting in less population and associated solid waste generation.

Similar to the No Action/No Project Alternative, Alternative D would result in an increase in solid waste generation within the Master Plan boundaries as compared to Year 2000 conditions. As a result, such increased solid waste generation could have the potential to contribute to a cumulative impact relative to solid waste, as compared to 1996 baseline conditions. As indicated above, the most notable major project in proximity to LAX is Playa Vista. Development of Playa Vista would exacerbate demands on constrained regional landfills. Other projects in the vicinity, relocated residents from the ANMP properties, and overall forecast growth throughout the region would result in cumulative increases in solid waste generation within the Los Angeles region. Due to the uncertainty regarding future landfill capacity, impacts associated with cumulative increases in solid waste generation would be potentially significant.

4.19.8 Mitigation Measures

Although total solid waste generation within the Master Plan boundaries associated with Alternatives A, B, C, and D would be less than that under the environmental baseline, LAWA would implement Master Plan Commitments SW-1, SW-2, and SW-3 to reduce airport-related solid waste generation from these alternatives. As a result, Alternatives A, B, C, and D would not have any significant impacts relative to project-related solid waste generation, and no mitigation would be required.

The following mitigation measure is materially the same as that identified in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.8), of the Draft EIS/EIR and is recommended to reduce cumulative solid waste impacts.

◆ **MM-SW-1. Provide Landfill Capacity to Accommodate Cumulative Solid Waste (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).**

Additional landfill capacity in the Los Angeles region should be provided through the siting of new landfills, the expansion of existing landfills, or the extension of permits for existing facilities to address the projected landfill capacity shortfall resulting from cumulative development. As an alternative, or to augment regional landfill capacity, landfill capacity outside the region could be accessed by developing the necessary rail haul infrastructure. The responsibility for implementing this mitigation

4.19 Solid Waste

measure lies with state, county, and local solid waste planning authorities. The costs for implementing this mitigation measure will be passed on to LAX and other solid waste generators through increased solid waste disposal costs.

4.19.9 Level of Significance After Mitigation

4.19.9.1 Alternatives A, B, and C

As stated in Section 4.19, *Solid Waste* (subsection 4.19.9), of the Draft EIS/EIR, cumulative impacts from development of Alternatives A, B, or C could be mitigated through implementation of MM-SW-1, Provide Landfill Capacity to Accommodate Cumulative Solid Waste (Alternatives A, B, C, and D). Implementation of this mitigation measure is the responsibility of another agency (or agencies). If this mitigation measure is not fully implemented, cumulative impacts associated with solid waste generation and disposal would remain significant.

4.19.9.2 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

The cumulative impacts from development of Alternative D could be mitigated through implementation of MM-SW-1, Provide Landfill Capacity to Accommodate Cumulative Solid Waste (Alternatives A, B, C, and D). Implementation of this mitigation measure is the responsibility of another agency (or agencies). If this mitigation measure is not fully implemented, cumulative impacts associated with solid waste generation and disposal would remain significant.