
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, division 13, § 21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code of Regs., title 14, § 15000 et seq.) to assist the California Environmental Protection Agency's (CalEPA's) Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) in considering the approval of a proposed Closure Plan of a hazardous waste treatment and storage facility owned and operated by Exide Technologies, Inc. (Exide), a secondary lead smelter (proposed Project). Exide requested DTSC's approval of a Closure Plan for the facility at 2700 South Indiana Street in Vernon, California (Exide facility), which was previously operating under Interim Status authorization under California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 66265 et seq.

Under the proposed Project, Exide would permanently close the facility and implement a DTSC-approved Closure Plan that would include dismantling operations and remediating contamination at the facility. The Closure Plan would outline a multi-year approach for removal and decontamination of contaminated equipment, structures, and soils at the site in three phases. The proposed Project assumes compliance with a number of regulatory actions aimed at reducing environmental hazards.

DTSC has principal responsibility for making a determination on the Closure Plan approval request and is the Lead Agency under CEQA for preparation and approval of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088 and 15132, an FEIR consists of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), a list of commenters as well as the verbal and written comments received on the DEIR, responses to significant environmental points received on the DEIR, and any information added to the document or any changes made to the text of the DEIR in response to comments. The FEIR contains an updated description of the proposed Project in Chapter 1, a copy of responses to all comments received on the DEIR in Chapter 2, and all changes made to the DEIR in Chapter 3.

This FEIR will support the permitting process of all agencies whose discretionary approvals must be obtained for particular elements of this Project. The FEIR is intended to provide

decision-makers and the public with the most up-to-date information available regarding the Project, required mitigation measures, and Project alternatives.

Proposed Project

The Exide facility and adjacent areas are located in the City of Vernon's (City's) M-2 heavy industrial/warehousing zone and are surrounded by industrial land uses.

The Exide facility has been used for a variety of metal fabrication and metal recovery operations since 1922, with the primary use consisting of lead-battery recycling since the late 1970s. During operation, Exide received spent (used) lead-acid batteries and other lead-bearing materials and recycled them to recover lead and polypropylene. The sulfuric acid in batteries was recycled and used in the on-site wastewater treatment system, and the polypropylene was sent to an off-site facility for recycling. In recent years, the Exide facility's average production was 100,000 to 120,000 tons of lead per year. This amount is equivalent to recycling approximately 11 million automotive batteries, which is about the same number of spent batteries generated in California annually. Approximately 85% of the recycled lead was derived from used automobile batteries, whereas the remaining 15% came from other batteries and scrap lead.

In 2014, Exide submitted a revised permit application for a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Hazardous Waste Facility Permit (Cal. Code Regs., title 22, article 2, § 66270.10 et seq.) to DTSC. At that time, Exide was implementing phased corrective action activities in accordance with a 2002 Corrective Action Consent Order with DTSC and operating under Interim Status authorization.

In March 2014, Exide ceased recycling operations at the facility to install new equipment to meet South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) requirements under a Stipulated Order for Abatement, which included meeting SCAQMD rules on arsenic emissions. From March 2014 to May 2015, maintenance, housekeeping, and improvement activities occurred, but recycling operations did not occur.

Operations were expected to resume in spring 2015 in order to begin stack testing of new equipment installed to comply with SCAQMD rules. In March 2015, however, Exide was required to cease operations and permanently close its facility pursuant to a Stipulation and Order between DTSC and Exide (2015 Amendment) and a Non-prosecution Agreement reached with the Department of Justice. As ordered by the 2015 Amendment, Exide withdrew its permit application and notified DTSC of its intent to close the facility permanently by implementing a DTSC-approved Closure Plan.

Under the proposed Project, Exide would permanently close the facility and implement the DTSC-approved Closure Plan, which would include dismantling operations and cleanup of the facility. The Closure Plan outlines a multi-year approach for removal and decontamination of equipment, structures, and soils at the facility during three phases, as follows:

- **Phase 1** would include removal of all hazardous wastes from all hazardous waste units; decontamination and removal of all contaminated equipment, structures, and soils; and subsurface soil and soil gas sampling to characterize the contamination under the equipment and structures. As outlined in the DEIR, Phase 1 of the proposed Project includes Exide's proposal to re-fire the gas burners to melt a portion of lead remaining on site. Phase 1 activities are expected to require 34 months to complete.
- **Phase 2** is contingent on the results of soil and soil gas sampling in Phase 1 and would include additional subsurface sampling to characterize potential contamination under the equipment and structures. Phase 2 would include removal of contaminated soil beneath the former equipment, buildings, structures, and pavement as well as restoration activities.
- **Phase 3** would include post-closure and contingent post-closure work to implement long-term inspections, monitoring, and maintenance.

As discussed in the DEIR, construction planning has already occurred for Phase 1 and elements of Phase 2, and those elements were analyzed at a project level. Phases 2 and 3 include contingent work elements based on Phase 1's subsurface soil and soil gas sampling results. Therefore, this FEIR includes both project-specific and programmatic analyses for Phases 2 and 3 to support the closure process. Consistent with the requirements of CEQA

(Cal. Code Regs., title 14, §§ 15168(c), 15063(c)(3)(D)), DTSC will consider construction plans for Phases 2 and 3, when they are available, in light of this FEIR and determine whether additional environmental analysis is necessary.

Alternatives to the Proposed Project

CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., title 14, § 15126.6) require that an EIR consider a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project, or to the location of the proposed Project, that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. Seven alternatives to the proposed Project (including the No Project Alternative) were developed based on comments received during public scoping, agency feedback on the proposed Closure Plan, and DTSC staff consideration. Through the alternatives analysis process presented in the DEIR, three alternatives were determined to meet most of the proposed Project objectives, to avoid or minimize the effects of the proposed Project, and to be potentially feasible, and these alternatives were carried forward for analysis in Chapter 6 of the DEIR. Because the proposed Project is legally mandated and site-specific, alternatives carried forward are limited to alternative construction designs that would achieve facility closure goals and objectives. In addition, while not legally feasible, the No Project Alternative was also carried forward for analysis in Chapter 6, consistent with the requirements of CEQA (Cal. Code Regs., title 14, § 15126.6(e)). The remaining three alternatives were considered and dismissed.

The following four alternatives were carried through the analysis of impacts in the DEIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project
- Alternative 2: Use of Rail to Transport Hazardous Construction Waste
- Alternative 3: Mechanical Removal of Lead from Kettles
- Alternative 4: Water Jet Cutting to Remove Lead from Kettles

The following alternatives were considered but eliminated from the analysis:

- Remediation but No Demolition of Buildings
- Isolated Transport of Hazardous Materials by Truck
- Use of Zero-emission Trucks

During the public comment period, a number of commenters requested that DTSC analyze additional methods of lead removal, in addition to Alternatives 3 and 4. Commenters suggested: 1) using larger cranes to remove intact kettles from the building, without first removing the lead from the kettles; and 2) using robots to mechanically remove the lead from kettles.

The use of robots to mechanically remove the lead from the kettles was deemed to be feasible, or at least potentially so. Use of larger cranes in conjunction with mechanical removal to reduce or avoid confined entry was also deemed to be feasible, or at least potentially so. Alternative 3 was accordingly modified in Chapter 3 of the FEIR to clarify that the use of robotic technology and larger cranes are consistent with this alternative.

After considering the proposed Closure Plan and comments received on the DEIR, DTSC determined that Alternative 3 is the preferred method of lead removal and will recommend its adoption to the decision-makers. Alternative 3 appears to be feasible and results in the least impacts and is thus the environmentally superior alternative. Consistent with that preference, the final Closure Plan, also recommended for approval, prohibits the use of re-firing the lead kettles and water jet cutting.

Final Closure Plan

Exide submitted its proposed Closure Plan to DTSC on May 15, 2015. DTSC issued a Notice of Deficiency on June 17, and Exide submitted a revised proposed Closure Plan on July 28, which is analyzed in the DEIR. DTSC reviewed the July 2015 proposed Closure Plan and, consistent with California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 66265.112(d)(5), requested further changes, which were included in the November 30 proposed Closure Plan. DTSC released the November 2015 proposed Closure Plan for public review on December 8, in conjunction with the DEIR.

The final Closure Plan, expected to be considered and approved by DTSC in late October or early November 2016, includes revisions to the November 2015 proposed Closure Plan based on comments received on the DEIR and November 2015 proposed Closure Plan. As noted elsewhere, the largest change between the proposed and final Closure Plan is that the final

Closure Plan would prohibit the use of re-firing the lead kettles. This change and all other changes were reviewed to determine whether any changes could impact the environmental analysis presented in the DEIR. Any changes that may affect the environmental analysis are presented in Chapter 3; no changes made to the Closure Plan trigger the need for further environmental review. The changes clarify ambiguities or further reduce environmental impacts. The final Closure Plan will be released to the public in conjunction with the FEIR. The final Closure Plan has not been approved by the decision-makers, and will be presented to the decision-makers along with the FEIR for consideration and potential approval.

Comments Received

The DEIR was released and distributed on December 8, 2015, for a 65-day review period. Approximately 25 copies of the DEIR were distributed to various government agencies, organizations, and repositories. In addition, DTSC sent more than 8,000 notices in both English and Spanish to surrounding communities to publicize the availability of the DEIR and provide information on the public hearing date and location.

The DEIR includes a full analysis and an Executive Summary that summarizes the proposed Project, alternatives, and findings. The Executive Summary was translated into Spanish. The DEIR is available online at DTSC's website and at seven publically accessible repositories. The Administrative Record is available at DTSC's Sacramento Regional office at 8800 Cal Center Drive, Sacramento, California, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Mondays through Fridays, excluding state holidays. All data submitted by Exide are available as part of the Administrative Record.

In January 2016, the 65-day review period was extended to March 28 for a total of 109 days. Notice of this change was given by direct mailing (more than 8,000 new notices were sent again in English and Spanish), email, and a posting on DTSC's website.

DTSC held a public hearing on February 3, 2016, at the City of Commerce, City Council Chambers, 2535 Commerce Way, Commerce, California. The meeting was conducted in English with simultaneous Spanish translation. DTSC staff began the hearing with an

overview of the proposed Closure Plan and DEIR organization and then opened the hearing to accept public comments on the proposed Project and environmental document.

DTSC received more than 900 individual comments on the DEIR from 14 agencies and organizations and 35 individuals. In addition, 11 individuals provided oral comments at the public hearing and 12 others provided comment cards to DTSC. All comments and responses to comments are presented in Chapter 2 of the FEIR.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

A summary of impacts is provided as Table ES-1. Mitigation measures can be found following Table ES-1.

**Table ES-1
Summary of Proposed Project Impacts**

	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impact Determination after Mitigation
Aesthetics			
A-1: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No impact	None	No impact
A-2: Would the proposed Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic resources within a state scenic highway?	No impact	None	No impact
A-3: Would the proposed Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
A-4: Would the proposed Project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
Air Quality			
AQ-1: Would the proposed Project emissions exceed any of the SCAQMD daily thresholds of significance in Table 3.2-5?	Significant	MM-AQ-1 MM-AQ-2	Significant and unavoidable
AQ-2: Would the proposed Project construction result in off-site ambient air pollutant concentrations that exceed any of the SCAQMD thresholds of significance shown in Table 3.2-5?	Significant	MM-AQ-1 MM-AQ-2	Significant and unavoidable
AQ-3: Would the proposed Project emissions expose the public to significant levels of TAC if impacts exceed any of the SCAQMD thresholds of significance in Table 3.2-5?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
AQ-4: Would the proposed Project emissions create an objectionable odor at the nearest sensitive receptor pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402, per thresholds of significance in Table 3.2-5?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
AQ-5: Would the proposed Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable AQMP or not conform to the most recent adopted SIP?	No impact	None	No impact

	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impact Determination after Mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG-1: Would the proposed Project GHG emissions, directly or indirectly, exceed the SCAQMD 10,000 mty CO ₂ e threshold?	Significant	MM-AQ-2	Significant and unavoidable
GHG-2: Would the proposed Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions and climate change impacts?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
Biological Resources			
BIO-1: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW and USFWS?	No impact	None	No impact
BIO-2: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW and USFWS?	No impact	None	No impact
BIO-3: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	No impact	None	No impact
BIO-4: Would the proposed Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	No impact	None	No impact
BIO-5: Would the proposed Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No impact	None	No impact
BIO-6: Would the proposed Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No impact	None	No impact
Cultural and Historic Resources			
CHR-1: Would the proposed Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?	No impact	None	No impact

	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impact Determination after Mitigation
CHR-2: Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
CHR-3: Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource?	Significant	MM-CHR-1	Less than significant impact
CHR-4: Would the proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?	Significant	MM-CHR-2	Less than significant impact
Geology and Soils			
GS-1: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury, or death?	Significant	None available	Significant and unavoidable
GS-2: Would the proposed Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
GS-3: Would the proposed Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the proposed Project?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
GS-4: Would the proposed Project be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
GS-5: Would the proposed Project be sited on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	No impact	None	No impact
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HAZ-1: Would the proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
HAZ-2: Would the proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact

	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impact Determination after Mitigation
HAZ-3: Would the proposed Project result in hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
HAZ-4: Would the proposed Project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
HAZ-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the proposed Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the study area?	No impact	None	No impact
HAZ-6: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the proposed Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the study area?	No impact	None	No impact
HAZ-7: Would the proposed Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No impact	None	No impact
HAZ-8: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	No impact	None	No impact
Land Use			
LU-1: Would the proposed Project physically divide an established community?	No impact	None	No impact
LU-2: Would the proposed Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the proposed Project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
Noise and Vibration			
NV-1: Expose people to, or generate, noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of Vernon's General Plan or in Section 12.08.440 of LACMC?	Significant	MM-NV-1 MM-NV-2 MM-NV-3	Less than significant impact

	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impact Determination after Mitigation
NV-2: Expose people to, or generate, ground-borne vibration levels in excess of the Caltrans vibration damage potential threshold criteria?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
NV-3: Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the study area above levels existing without the proposed Project?	No impact	None	No impact
NV-4: Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the study area above levels existing without the proposed Project?	Significant	MM-NV-1 MM-NV-2	Less than significant impact
NV-5: Expose people residing or working on the proposed Project site to excessive noise levels as a result of activities at a public airport or private airstrip?	No impact	None	No impact
Public Services and Utilities			
PSU-1: Would the proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
PSU-2: Would the proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
PSU-3: Would the proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for schools?	No impact	None	No impact

	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impact Determination after Mitigation
PSU-4: Would the proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for other public facilities?	No impact	None	No impact
PSU-5: Would the proposed Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB or exceed available capacity to treat wastewater by the wastewater treatment provider?	No impact	None	No impact
PSU-6: Would the proposed Project generate solid non-hazardous waste in excess of permitted landfill capacity?	No impact	None	No impact
PSU-7: Would the proposed Project exceed the capacity of existing distribution systems or require or result in the construction of new facilities for the generation or transmission of electrical power that would have significant environmental effects?	No impact	None	No impact
PSU-8: Would the proposed Project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
Traffic and Transportation			
TT-1: Would the proposed Project construction result in a short-term, temporary increase in truck and auto traffic?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
TT-2: Would long-term vehicular traffic associated with the proposed Project significantly impact the V/C ratio or LOS?	No impact	None	No impact
TT-3: Would an increase in on-site employees due to proposed Project operations increase public transit use?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
TT-4: Would the proposed Project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation?	No impact	None	No impact

	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Impact Determination after Mitigation
Water Quality and Hydrology			
WQH-1: Would the proposed Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
WQH-2: Would the proposed Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?	No impact	None	No impact
WQH-3: Would the proposed Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
WQH-4: Would the proposed Project create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
WQH-5: Would the proposed Project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	No impact	None	No impact
WQH-6: Would the proposed Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	No impact	None	No impact
WQH-7: Would the proposed Project place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows?	No impact	None	No impact
WQH-8: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Less than significant impact	None	Less than significant impact
WQH-9: Would the proposed Project contribute to hazards from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No impact	None	No impact

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that will be considered by DTSC as part of the FEIR approval process.

MM-AQ-1: Increase engine tier: 100% of all off-road equipment with USEPA Tier 4 engines

One hundred percent of diesel-powered construction equipment with greater than 50 horsepower must meet USEPA Tier 4 off-road emission standards, unless the contractor can provide proof that any of these circumstances exist:

- Tier 4 equipment is unavailable through a leasing agreement within 200 miles of the project.
- The contractor applied (within 30 days after DTSC approves the Closure Implementation Plan) for incentive funds to cover the cost of putting controls on a piece of uncontrolled equipment planned for use on the project, but the application is not yet approved or the application has been approved but funds are not yet available.
- The contractor ordered (within 30 days after DTSC approves the Closure Implementation Plan), but has not yet received, a control device for a piece of equipment planned for use on the project.
- The contractor has ordered (within 30 days after DTSC approves the Closure Implementation Plan), but has not yet received, controlled equipment to replace uncontrolled equipment.

MM-AQ-2: Conduct construction equipment best management practices

The following best management practices and measures are required for construction equipment, including on-road trucks used during construction:

- Use clean diesel (less than 15 parts per million [ppm] sulfur) in all diesel-powered equipment.
- Maintain all equipment in good working order and according to manufacturers' specifications.
- Restrict idling of construction equipment to a maximum of 5 minutes when not in use.
- Use diesel oxidation catalysts and catalyzed diesel particulate traps, where available.

- DTSC, in consultation with SCAQMD, will determine the technical feasibility of this emissions control equipment once the contractor identifies and secures a final equipment list.
- Use electric-powered cranes, where technically feasible
 - DTSC, in consultation with SCAQMD, will determine technical feasibility of electric cranes once the contractor identifies and secures a final equipment list.

MM-CHR-1: Stop work in area if prehistoric or historical archaeological resources are encountered

In the unlikely event that any artifact or an unusual amount of bone, shell, or non-native stone is encountered during construction, work shall be immediately stopped and relocated to another area. The contractor shall stop construction within 10 meters (30 feet) of the exposure of these finds until a qualified archaeologist can be retained to evaluate the find (see 36 C.F.R. § 800.11.1 and Cal. Code Regs., title 14, § 15064.5(f)). Examples of such cultural materials might include concentrations of ground stone tools such as mortars, bowls, pestles, and manos; chipped stone tools such as projectile points or choppers; flakes of stone not consistent with the immediate geology such as obsidian or fused shale; a historic trash pit containing bottles and/or ceramics; or structural remains. If the resources are found to be significant, they shall be avoided or shall be mitigated consistent with State Historic Preservation Office Guidelines.

MM-CHR-2: Stop work in area if human remains are encountered

In the event of the accidental discovery of human remains, the following steps should be taken:

- Work shall be immediately stopped. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:
 - The coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered is contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required
 - If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American:
 - The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.

- The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.
- The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code, section 5097.98.
- Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.
 - The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent, or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.
 - The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation.
 - The landowner or the authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

MM-NV-1: Construction equipment controls

All mobile or stationary internal-combustion-engine powered equipment or machinery shall be equipped with suitable exhaust and air-intake silencers in proper working order.

MM-NV-2: Noise monitoring for businesses

Throughout the duration of the proposed Project, the contractor shall conduct noise monitoring at 3800-3840 East 26th Street (the nearest business structure to the northwest) and 4010 East 26th Street (the nearest business structure to the southeast). If measurements indicate that the maximum noise level generated by the equipment and deconstruction activities at the site exceeds 85 decibels (dBA) at the business structure, the contractor shall reduce the maximum noise level to less than 85 dBA. Steps may include one or more of the following: 1) reduce the number and/or types of equipment operating simultaneously; 2) erect partial enclosures or barriers around the noisy equipment items; 3) erect a temporary

noise barrier along the property line between the Exide facility and the adjacent industrial building; and/or 4) use quieter equipment or processes.

MM-NV-3: Noise monitoring for residences

Throughout the duration of the proposed Project, if construction or deconstruction activities occur between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., the contractor shall conduct noise monitoring at the nearest residence to the Exide facility, located on East Vernon Avenue west of South Downey Road in Vernon (approximately 0.6 mile from the facility). If the measurements indicate that the maximum noise level generated by the equipment and deconstruction activities at the site exceeds 50 dBA at the residence, the contractor shall reduce the maximum noise level to less than 50 dBA. Steps may include one or more of the following: 1) reduce the number and/or type of equipment operating simultaneously; 2) erect partial enclosures or barriers around the noisy equipment items; 3) erect temporary noise barriers along the property lines of the Exide facility; and/or 4) use quieter equipment or processes.

In addition to the above mitigation measures, the following project condition will be added to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for tracking purposes.

Project Condition 1: Truck routes

All routes will proceed from the facility directly toward Bandini Boulevard, turn left onto Bandini Boulevard, and merge onto I-710. Directions to 2801 N. Madera Road will be revised to proceed to I-710 using this route. Note that transportation routes may change due to planned and unplanned road closures. The Contractor will ensure that drivers understand the approved truck routes and will provide a written statement confirming that the transportation routes have been provided and reviewed by the truck driver(s) and the route will be followed, except to the extent that road closures require an alternate route. A copy of the map clearly depicting these routes, as well as hours of operation, will be provided to all workers hauling material to and from the site. Any change from the Bandini Boulevard to I-710 portion of routes will require DTSC approval. Trucks using alternate routes will be documented on a transportation log that includes the date, time, truck identification, manifest number, route taken, and contents of load. The transportation log will be submitted to DTSC daily when there are entries.

All trucks leaving the facility will be marked with a yellow flag having a visible area of at least 1 square foot, attached to the high rear end of the trailer in a location visible to pedestrians. As feasible, project-related truck and construction vehicle traffic shall be directed away from school campuses (even in the event of planned or unplanned road closures). In the event that trucks are routed within 0.25 mile (surface streets) of a campus, DTSC or the contractor shall coordinate with the school administrator or designee to avoid pedestrian and vehicular routes to schools during the start and end of the school day. In addition, the Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD's) Office of Environmental Health and Safety (OEHS) must be advised by calling (213) 241-3199. The Pedestrian Route to School map is available on LAUSD's website.¹ In the event that Project-related traffic must transect pedestrian or vehicular routes to schools, the LAUSD's Transportation Branch must be contacted at (213) 580-2950 and LAUSD's OEHS must be advised by calling (213) 241-3199. The project manager or designee should notify LAUSD of the expected start and end dates for various portions of the Project that may affect traffic through the areas. Trucks and construction vehicles may encounter school buses using red flashing lights and must stop, per provisions in the California Vehicle Code.

Project Condition 2: Health and Safety Plan

(a) Before the Closure Plan is implemented, the contractor must prepare a draft Health and Safety Plan and provide it to DTSC for review and approval. To assist in preparing the Health and Safety Plan, Exide must provide the contractor with all comments on the DEIR that pertain to the Health and Safety Plan and the responses to those comments. When preparing the Health and Safety Plan, the contractor must consider those comments, in addition to the standards and regulations contained in 29 Code of Federal Regulations, parts 1910 and 1926, and any other applicable law.

(b) The Health and Safety Plan must comply with the most up-to-date standards for occupational lead exposure adopted by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA), even if the regulations implementing those standards have not yet gone into effect.

¹ LAUSD, 2016. Office of Environmental Health & Safety Pedestrian Routes to School. Available at: <http://www.lausd-oehs.org/saferoutestoschools.asp>.

(c) The Health and Safety Plan must provide appropriate protections for workers operating in a confined space, if confined space work is specified in the Closure Implementation Plan to remove lead from kettles; these protections must comply with 29 Code of Federal Regulations, part 1910, title 8, sections 5156-5158.

(d) The Health and Safety Plan must be reviewed at least annually by the contractor and updated if changes in the environmental conditions or project operations warrant modifications. The Health and Safety Plan must also be updated to reflect changes in 29 Code of Federal Regulations, parts 1910 and 1926, or applicable provisions of the California Code of Regulations. The updated plan must be submitted to DTSC for review and approval. All contracts and subcontracts associated with the project must specify that contractors and subcontractors will comply with the most updated Health and Safety Plan.