

Executive Summary

1 ES.1 Intended Uses and Authorizing Agencies

2 This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) fulfills the requirements of the California Environmental Quality
3 Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.), *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment*
4 *Guidelines* (February 2009), *County of Ventura Administrative Supplement to the State CEQA Guidelines*
5 (August 3, 1999). According to State CEQA Guidelines [California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14,
6 Division 6, Chapter 3, §15121(a)], the purpose of an EIR is to serve as an informational document that
7 “...will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect
8 of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to
9 the project”.

10 ES.2 Project Purpose and Need and Project Objectives

11 CEQA requires that an EIR state the objectives of a proposed project to explain the reasons for project
12 development, and why this particular solution is currently being recommended. Additionally, the project
13 objectives are instrumental in determining which alternatives should be considered in the document.

14 The purpose of the proposed project is to provide waste disposal capacity within Ventura County to meet the
15 County’s current and projected waste diversion and disposal needs consistent with the goals and policies of
16 the Ventura County General Plan, Ventura County Integrated Waste Management Plan, the requirements of
17 Assembly Bill (AB) 939, and other California waste management laws and regulations. The specific
18 objectives of the proposed project include the following:

- 19 • Provide a minimum of 15 years of waste diversion and disposal capacity to meet state-mandated
20 waste diversion goals;
- 21 • Provide an environmentally waste disposal and diversion operation that complies with local, state,
22 and federal regulations and plans;
- 23 • Minimize adverse impacts to environmental resources; and
- 24 • Provide harmony between the project and adjacent land uses.

25 ES.3 Description of the Project and Alternatives

26 Project Location

27 The Simi Valley Landfill and Recycling Center (SVLRC) is located in an unincorporated area of southeast
28 Ventura County within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 minute Simi Valley West
29 topographic quadrangle (Figure 2.1-1). The site is north of State Route (SR)-118 and west of the Madera
30 Road overcrossing. The site entrance is approximately 2,800 feet west of Madera Road. The facility address is
31 2801 Madera Road, Simi Valley, California 93065.

32 Project Overview

33 The SVLRC is an existing Class III (non-hazardous) municipal solid waste (MSW) landfill permitted to
34 receive 3,000 tons per day (tpd) of MSW. In addition to waste disposal, SVLRC engages in recycling,
35 including materials such as green waste, wood waste, asphalt/concrete, white goods, and scrap metal.

1 SVLRC, which is located in southeast Ventura County, California near the City of Simi Valley, is owned and
2 operated by Waste Management of California, Inc. (WMC) under Conditional Use Permit (CUP)-3142-7.

3 The proposed project (Permit Case No. LU07-0048; Major Modification No. 8 to CUP-3142) is an expansion
4 of the existing SVLRC. The proposed expansion is comprised of five main components: (1) expanding the
5 physical limits of the landfill (CUP boundary, landfill footprint, and elevation); (2) extending the operating
6 limits and life of the site (increasing the waste disposal capacity); (3) constructing support/ancillary facility
7 area; (4) expanding existing and constructing new recycling and resources recovery facilities; and (5)
8 expanding existing and constructing new energy conversion facilities.

9 The SVLRC's CUP boundary is proposed to be expanded to encompass 887 acres within which the waste
10 disposal area would be expanded north and west from its current permitted location to encompass 186 acres of
11 additional waste disposal area and to increase the total capacity of the landfill from 43.5 to 130.2 million
12 cubic yards. The amount of MSW that could be received per day is proposed to increase from 3,000 tons to
13 6,000 tons and the amount of recycling to be reduced from 6,250 tpd to 3,250 tpd. The total daily tonnage
14 (i.e., combined MSW and recyclables) permitted for the facility would not change. Additionally, several
15 existing ancillary facilities (defined facilities ancillary to the active landfill such as the waste receiving and
16 recycling facilities for the purpose of this project) and support facilities (defined as facilities that support the
17 landfill operation such as administrative offices and maintenance facilities for the purpose of this project)
18 would be expanded and new facilities constructed within the landfill CUP boundary including: office
19 building; heavy equipment and vehicle maintenance facility; waste hauling yard; material recovery
20 facility/recyclable transfer facility (MRF/RTF); public household hazardous waste collection facility; new
21 entrance road, scales, and scale house; expanded construction and demolition (C&D) debris recycling
22 processing area; expanded green waste processing facility; expanded landfill gas-to-energy (LFGTE) facility;
23 and landfill gas-to-liquefied natural gas (LFGTLNG) facility. The proposed project would require a major
24 modification to the existing SVLRC CUP (CUP 3142-7) issued by the County of Ventura.

25 **Construction**

26 Construction of the SVLRC Expansion Project would involve two types of construction and occur in four
27 phases. The initial construction activities would include the construction of facilities in the 30-acre
28 support/ancillary facilities area (including the MRF/RTF, Simi Valley Environmental Collection Center
29 (SVECC), waste hauling yard, office facilities, heavy equipment and vehicle maintenance Facility, and new
30 scales and scalehouse). This initial construction would also include expansion of the existing LFGTE facility
31 and construction of a LFGTLNG facility. The C&D debris recycling activities and green waste processing
32 operations would occur on the landfill footprint in an area not receiving waste and would migrate from place
33 to place within the landfill as portions are filled to capacity. Construction of additional waste depository space
34 within the waste disposal area would also occur during Phase I. Subsequent construction activities would
35 involve the sequential excavation of Phases II through IV of the waste footprint and would include clearing,
36 compacting, and preparing the phase(s) for landfilling.

37 The approximately 30-acre support/ancillary facilities area would be completed within approximately 18
38 months of project approval. Phase I of the waste footprint would include additional filling of the existing
39 landfill area. Construction of Phase II would begin as Phase I approaches its design capacity, which has been
40 estimated to take approximately seven to eight years. The construction of each subsequent phase would begin
41 as the previous phase reaches capacity (estimated to take between 12 to 14 years).

42 During peak construction, the construction workforce would include approximately 45 personnel for the 30-
43 acre support/ancillary facilities area. The waste disposal areas would be constructed in four consecutive
44 phases with each phase divided into cells. Phase I would be comprised of one cell and would require 29
45 personnel including 18 equipment operators, 9 construction personnel, and 2 managers. Phase II would be
46 comprised of four cells and would require 116 construction personnel. Phases III and IV would each contain

three cells and require 87 personnel. Wastes generated from construction would either be hauled within the landfill for disposal or recycling or off-site to local recycling centers.

Operations

Landfill operations include waste receipt and or disposal, waste hauling within the landfill footprint, application of daily and intermediate cover, and site grading and maintenance. As the landfill expands, additional excavation would begin in new phases, and other heavy equipment operations would occur on the surface of areas surrounding the refuse columns.

Currently, SVLRC is permitted for a maximum limit of 822 round trips per day (except for the “free days” as directed by the Agreement for the Operation and Closure of the Simi Valley Landfill pursuant to County Ordinance 4760). Based on an analysis of the current average waste delivery, the SVLRC currently receives approximately 470 truck round trips (i.e., vehicles entering and leaving) per day of waste. This includes approximately 178 vehicle round trips hauling MSW and 292 vehicles round trips delivering recyclable materials. Additionally, the facility receives approximately 22 employee vehicle round trips per day.¹ This is considered the baseline condition.

As part of the proposed project, SVLRC is projected to generate up to a total of 892 vehicle trips (roundtrips) per day. This number involves up to 6,000 tpd of solid waste (547 round trips) and up to 3,250 tpd of recyclable materials (345 round trips). This would result in the permitted total of up to 9,250 tpd of materials hauled to the site (Table 2.4-14). The additional truck trips associated with MSW are expected to be large capacity transfer trucks, resulting in fewer trips for a given tonnage of waste than is the case when smaller local trucks dominate the truck trips. In addition to the trips associated with the transport of waste (including the relocation of the GI Rubbish waste hauling yard to the SVLRC) and recyclable materials to the site, employees of SVLRC and GI Rubbish are expected to generate an average of approximately 405 daily roundtrips, bringing the total maximum projected vehicle trips (roundtrips) to 1,297 per day. Thus, the proposed SVLRC Expansion Project would result in a net increase of 475 vehicle round trips per day above SVLRC’s permitted limit and 786 vehicle round trips above the baseline condition.

The actual volume of any specific material varies on a daily basis. Therefore, it is the projected daily total (1,297 round trips) that defines maximum traffic for the proposed project, not the number of trips by type of vehicle or by type of waste.

Municipal solid waste and recyclables from the local community would be delivered to SVLRC in packer trucks for disposal in the landfill for processing in the MRF/RTF. Each truck would be weighed and specific information about its origin documented at the weigh station. The GI Rubbish fleet of packer trucks would be sent out multiple times per day, but would remain at the SVLRC in the proposed waste hauling yard at the end of each day. GI Rubbish packer trucks would also be maintained at the proposed Heavy Equipment and Vehicle Maintenance Facility within the SVLRC.

SVLRC would continue to receive transfer trucks, trucks carrying recyclables, and trucks carrying roll-off bins. Each truck would be weighed and specific information about its origin documented at the weigh station. The trucks would dispose of their contents at the tipping areas based on the type of commodity they are carrying. To the maximum extent possible, trucks bringing material in would be reloaded and sent outbound with material from the MRF/RTF and resource recovery facility areas. The trucks would be weighed upon leaving the facility.

The proposed project would result in an overall increase of 150 employees. Currently, SVLRC and GI Rubbish employ 250 personnel of which 25 are located at SVLRC and 225 (135 drivers and 90 customer

¹ Based on data provided by WMC from January through March 2008.

1 service, shop, support, and management personnel) are located off-site at the existing GI Rubbish hauling
2 facility. Under the proposed project the existing hauling facility would be relocated to the SVLRC and the
3 hauling facility personnel would increase to 350 (225 drivers and 125 customer service/billing staff, shop,
4 support, and management personnel) over the life of the project. Additionally, the landfill personnel would
5 increase to 50 personnel.

6 The expanded SVLRC would continue to comply with the currently permitted hours of operation: 6:00 AM to
7 8:00 PM, 7 days per week, 365 days per year. However, SVLRC is typically closed on New Year's Day,
8 Easter Sunday, Memorial Day, July 4, Labor Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. The hauling vehicle fleet
9 would operate between the hours of 4:00 AM and 8:00 PM, 7 days per week, 365 days per year with the
10 exception of the holidays listed above. However, it should be noted that current operations occur six days a
11 week plus one Sunday per month. Other activities such as LFG and leachate collection/disposal, equipment
12 and vehicle maintenance, MRF/RTF operations, and compliance tasks would not be limited by this condition.

13 An updated closure plan would be prepared to take into account the revised fill plan, the increased waste
14 disposal capacity, and the extended site life. The closure plan would be submitted to the Ventura County
15 Environmental Health Division, which is the local enforcement agency (LEA) for solid waste disposal
16 facilities, along with the application for revision of the Solid Waste Facilities Permit (SWFP).

17 The SVLRC would be filled sequentially within the four phases. Once the landfill reaches capacity it would
18 be brought to final grade and the final alternative evapotranspirative cover currently approved under
19 SVLRC's Closure/Post-Closure Maintenance Plan would be installed (Geosyntec 2002).

20 WMC has an existing Post-Closure Maintenance and Monitoring Agreement to ensure protection of the
21 surrounding environment during the closure period (a minimum of 30 years after the last wastes have been
22 deposited). This agreement would be extended to include the proposed project area.

23 As required by 27 CCR §21190(c), all proposed post-closure land uses, other than non-irrigated open
24 space, shall be submitted to the LEA, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
25 (LARWQCB), Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD), and local land use agency for
26 review. The LEA must review and approve proposed post-closure land uses if the proposed use involves
27 structures within 1,000 feet of the disposal area, structures on top of waste, modification of the low
28 permeability layer, or irrigation over waste.

29 **Environmental Design**

30 Currently, the SVLRC is required to comply with a variety of plans and programs to reduce the impacts of
31 operation on both the work area and surrounding area as conditions of the landfill's CUP permit. Programs
32 include, but are not limited to, groundwater and leachate monitoring program; gas emissions control and
33 monitoring program; wind monitoring program; noise abatement plan; visual impact mitigation program; fire
34 protection program; seismic design; clay and cover availability study; site sign program; noise abatement
35 plan; hazardous waste exclusion program; radioactive waste exclusion program; emergency procedures
36 program; on-site drainage control plan; and stockpile plans. Several of these programs are outlined below.

37 As a part of the routine daily activities, the site supervisor periodically inspects the facility to ensure the
38 operation is in compliance with applicable regulations, especially 27 CCR §20005-20890, and standard
39 operating policies.

40 These plans and programs would be reviewed prior to approval of a modification to the existing CUP to
41 determine if changes would be required to address the specific features of the modified permit and current
42 regulations.

1 **Alternatives**

2 The following alternatives were considered, but eliminated from further analysis:

3 **Offsite Alternatives** – Other waste-disposal options for Ventura County, including:

- 4 • Expand the Toland Road Landfill: (eliminated based on the inability of the applicant and/or County
5 to implement and the low potential to reduce project environmental impact);
- 6 • Develop a new landfill in western Ventura County (eliminated based on the inability of the applicant
7 and/or County to implement, the low potential to reduce project environmental impacts, and the
8 substantial associated costs);
- 9 • Transport waste to out-of-County or out-of-state landfill sites via Countywide transfer facility
10 (eliminated based on: the inability of the applicant and/or County to implement; potential for
11 equivalent or greater environmental impacts as compared to the proposed project; and the substantial
12 associated costs); and
- 13 • Install multiple waste-to-energy facilities (thermal incinerators) at locations near sources of waste
14 within Ventura County ((eliminated because of: the inability of the applicant and/or County to
15 implement; potential for equivalent or greater environmental impacts as compared to the proposed
16 project; and the substantial associated costs).

17 **Alternative On-Site Technologies** – Other waste disposal technologies (i.e., conversion, diversion, and
18 minimization technologies) that can be implemented once waste reaches the SVLRC to reduce the amount of
19 material deposited in SVLRC, including:

- 20 • Aerobic bioreactor technology (eliminated based: on the incompatibility of the technology with
21 current landfill operations at SVLRC; its increased need for water as compared to the proposed
22 project; and substantial cost as compared to the proposed project);
- 23 • Thermal incinerator technology (eliminated based on: the potential of this technology to result in
24 additional environmental impacts including air quality issues and the production of residual ash; and
25 the substantial costs as compared to the proposed project); and
- 26 • Thermochemical technologies (eliminated based on the potential of this technology to result in
27 additional environmental impacts including increased air pollutant emissions and the production of
28 residual non-degradable material that would need to be disposed of conventionally; and the
29 substantial costs as compared to the proposed project).

30 **Alternative Policy & Permit Options** – Permit requirements, changes to public policy, or the
31 implementation of programs to reduce the amount of waste received by landfills in Ventura County,
32 including:

- 33 • Education/outreach program to decrease the need for landfill facilities (eliminated based on the
34 uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of educational outreach and how the applicant or the County
35 could feasibly implement this alternative, and based on potentially high associated costs);
- 36 • Change California policies to increase diversion and recycling (eliminated based on: the uncertainty
37 of how the applicant or the County would change state policies to increase the incentive for recycling
38 without widespread collaboration and support; and the costs of pursuing this policy change are
39 unknown, but possibly considerable); and
- 40 • Impose a watershed boundary on the SVLRC to limit the geographic area from which waste could be
41 received (eliminated based on the legal infeasibility of the County to implement a watershed
42 boundary without violating the commerce clause of the U.S.).

1 Table ES.3-1 provides an overview of the key features of the proposed project as compared to the five project
 2 alternatives.

Table ES.3-1. Comparison of Key Parameters Among Alternatives

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1 Reduced Capacity</i>	<i>Alternative 2 Bioreactor</i>	<i>Alternative 3 Graduated Permit Limit</i>	<i>Alternative 4 Differential Surcharge</i>	<i>Alternative 5 No Project</i>
Landfill Height (above MSL)	1,270	1,193 – 1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,118
Landfill Area (acres)	371	307	371	371	371	185
Daily Permitted Disposal (Tons)	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	3,000
Daily Permitted with Recycling (Tons)	3,250	3,250	3,250	3,250	3,250	6,250
Total Capacity (million yd ³)	123	112 - 86	123+	123	123	43.5
Building Area (sq ft)	127,000	127,000	127,000	127,000	127,000	20,000
Net Increase of Employees on-site	150	150	150	150	150	0
Closure year	2054	2049 - 2044	2054+	2054	2054	2024
LFGTE Units (total)	5	5	6	5	5	2
LNG Units (total)	1	1	1	1	1	0
Water Use (afy)	174	174	290	174	174	97 ¹
<i>Note:</i>						
1. Based on the actual water usage at SVLRC during 2008						

3 **Alternative 1: Reduced Landfill Capacity Alternative**

4 The Reduced Landfill Capacity Alternative would involve either reducing the overall height of the landfill,
 5 reducing the overall footprint of the area used to deposit waste, or some combination of the two. Reducing the
 6 landfill capacity would have the effect of limiting the overall volume of waste the landfill could receive over
 7 its lifetime.

8 Depending on the approach to reducing the overall capacity of the landfill, the reduction in capacity could
 9 range from 11 million cubic yards (approximately 8.7 million tons) to 37 million cubic yards (28.1 million
 10 tons). At an estimated annual receipt rate of 2.6 million tons per year at fully permitted capacity based on
 11 current operational levels, these capacity reductions would reduce the landfill life by approximately 3 to 10
 12 years. The reductions would modestly reduce visual impacts and potential biological impacts if the landfill
 13 footprint were reduced.

14 In all other respects, the Reduced Landfill Capacity Alternative would be identical to the proposed project.
 15 All other proposed project components would be constructed, including the: office building; heavy
 16 equipment and vehicle maintenance facility; waste hauling yard; MRF/RTF; public household hazardous
 17 waste collection facility; new entrance road, scales, and scale house; expanded C&D debris recycling
 18 processing; expanded green waste processing; additional LFGTE generator units; and LFGTLNG facility.

19 **Alternative 2: Anaerobic Bioreactor Technology Alternative**

20 Under this alternative, the existing waste disposal area (Phase I) would continue operating as it has in the past
 21 until it reaches capacity. All future phases would be developed as in-situ anaerobic bioreactor cells. Although
 22 prepared similarly to a standard landfill cell, bioreactor cells require different liner systems as well as
 23 substantially modified and expanded leachate and landfill gas recovery systems and could not be implemented

1 in the Phase I where portions are unlined and the lined areas were not designed for bioreactor systems.
2 Therefore, it is not feasible to implement bioreactor technology on Phase I.

3 Within the permitted footprint area, approximately five bioreactor cells would be constructed instead of
4 traditional landfill cells. The exact number and size of cells would depend on design considerations and the
5 optimal allocation of available landfill volume to ensure acceptable cell function. Each cell would have a
6 capacity of approximately 12 to 15 million cubic yards and would take from 7 to 8 years to fill at the
7 permitted level of 6,000 tons per day. If less than 6,000 tons per day is received, on average, in any future
8 year, the effective life would be correspondingly extended by an unknown amount. Anaerobic processing
9 would require approximately 170,000 gallons per day of additional water over and above what is currently
10 consumed at the site. There is no confirmed readily available local source for water (e.g. industrial process
11 waste water) in the immediate vicinity of the landfill, so the source of water for anaerobic operations is
12 uncertain. This alternative is analyzed based on the assumption that a reasonably available and reasonably
13 priced water source can be found.

14 In most other respects, the Anaerobic Bioreactor Technology Alternative would be the same as the proposed
15 project. All other proposed project components would be constructed, including the office building; heavy
16 equipment and vehicle maintenance facility; waste hauling yard; MRF/RTF; public household hazardous
17 waste collection facility; new entrance road, scales, and scale house; expanded C&D debris recycling
18 processing; and expanded green waste processing would be constructed as for the proposed project.
19 Bioreactors are expected to maximize landfill gas production, potentially requiring expanding the number of
20 LFGTE generator units plus the LFGTLNG facility. For the purpose of the environmental impact analysis, it
21 is assumed here that one additional LFGTE generator. The LFGTLNG facility would be built as proposed.

22 Anaerobic bioreactor cell technology would accelerate waste decomposition compared to the standard
23 restricted moisture disposal methods currently employed and required by regulations. For the purposes of
24 analysis, it is assumed that decomposition in a cell would take approximately 10 years, rather than more than
25 30 for a typical dry cell technology. At maximum decomposition, the volume would be reduced to
26 approximately 60 percent of the original airspace of the cell (allowing for decomposition, settlement, and the
27 application of daily cover) in 10 years or less making 40 percent of the originally available airspace available
28 for additional disposal.

29 Therefore, each cell would be reactivated after the contents complete decomposition approximately 10 years
30 following its first closure. The newly available 40 percent of the original capacity would then be prepared to
31 accept more waste and the cell would again be operated as an anaerobic reactor until filled and the contents
32 have decomposed. The effect of the anaerobic bioreactor implementation would be to provide for the reuse of
33 waste capacity made available through the accelerated decomposition process during continuing operations.
34 This would increase the overall capacity of a given volume of landfill to accept waste over the life of the
35 project.

36 **Alternative 3: Phased Permitted Daily Tonnage Limit Alternative**

37 Under this alternative, the SVLRC Expansion Project would proceed as described under the proposed project.
38 However, the permitted daily tonnage limit would be incrementally increased from its current 3,000 ton per
39 day level, to an intermediate limit of 4,500 tons per day immediately following permit approval, and,
40 ultimately, to the full 6,000 tons per day in 2014. Upon approval of the CUP modification (anticipated to be in
41 2009), the SVLRC would comply with a daily tonnage limit of 4,500 tpd through 2013. Between 2014 and
42 2052 (expected closure date) the permitted daily tonnage limit would be increased to 6,000 tpd. This
43 alternative may result in a reduction in truck traffic in the near term, and a potential reduction in the
44 associated traffic/circulation impacts as compared to the proposed project until the full 6,000 tons per day is
45 being received. However, it is unclear, since the facility currently fails to receive its full 3,000 ton per day

1 limit except very occasionally, whether waste receipts under phased permit limits would actually differ from
2 those without such limits.

3 Receipts are very unlikely to suddenly jump from an average of about 2,500 tons per day currently to 6,000
4 tons per day if the permit is issued for the new facility. Realistically, there would be a period of time after the
5 permit is issued when receipts would gradually ramp up to the full 6,000 tons per day. The most likely driver
6 of significant increased receipts would be the closure of a major nearby landfill. Since the Puente Hills
7 landfill is scheduled to close in 2013, it would be reasonable to expect an incremental increase at that time.
8 Whether an additional 3,000 tons per day would begin being delivered to the SVLRC when Puente Hills
9 closes is difficult to predict. Puente Hills is currently permitted to receive 13,200 tons per day and regularly
10 closes early when this limit is reached. It is unlikely that 3,000 tons per day (about 22 percent) of that waste
11 stream would be delivered to SVLRC following the Puente Hills closure given several other closer available
12 landfills. However, when other landfills in the vicinity close, it is reasonable to expect the SVLRC to be a
13 logical choice for alternate disposal. Since the Puente Hills landfill closure is the earliest major landfill
14 closure scheduled, it is unlikely that an increment of more than 1,500 tons per day (i.e. to the 4,500 tons per
15 day intermediate phased limit) would be received prior to 2014.

16 ***Alternative 4: Differential Surcharge Alternative***

17 Under this alternative, the SVLRC Expansion Project would be constructed as considered under the proposed
18 project. However, the waste received by SVLRC would be limited indirectly by a fee schedule established by
19 the County that would require higher payments for disposal of waste from outside a specified geographic area.
20 This alternative would need to be accompanied by a system whereby waste haulers would be required to
21 provide documentation or other certification of waste origin to the landfill operator, who would, in turn, be
22 required to provide documentation to the County, along with payment of the surcharges, demonstrating that
23 fees were properly collected on out-of-area wastes. The additional surcharge on out-of-area waste is expected
24 to discourage haulers from outside the area from using the SVLRC by making it more costly than alternative
25 facilities with lower total charges (tipping fees plus surcharge). Existing waste collection and disposal
26 contracts should be considered to ensure that long term patterns of waste collection and disposal are not
27 disrupted unnecessarily. Issues related to the documentation of waste sources required to enforce the
28 boundary would need to be resolved, as would reporting and enforcement mechanisms.

29 Implementing a graduated surcharge system would prolong the working life of the SVLRC by limiting
30 receipts from sources outside the area of lowest surcharge. This alternative has the potential to reduce impacts
31 from truck traffic compared to the proposed project since the distance between the origin and destination of
32 waste may be reduced and the amount of waste delivered for disposal may not result in the full permitted
33 6,000 tons per day being received.

34 In all other respects, the Graduated Surcharge Alternative would be identical to the proposed project. All
35 other proposed project components would be constructed, including: the office building; heavy equipment and
36 vehicle maintenance facility; waste hauling yard; MRF/RTF; public household hazardous waste collection
37 facility; new entrance road, scales, and scale house; expanded C&D debris recycling processing; expanded
38 green waste processing; additional LFGTE generator units; and LFGTLNG facility would be constructed as
39 for the proposed project.

40 ***Alternative 5: No Project Alternative***

41 As specified in the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e), an EIR must evaluate the specific alternative
42 of "no project" along with its potential impacts. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project
43 alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the
44 impacts of not approving the proposed project.

1 For this EIR, the No Project Alternative is defined as no approval of an expansion of the existing SVLRC.
2 Under the No Project Alternative, the SVLRC would continue operating under the existing Conditional Use
3 Permit (CUP 3142). On or before 2034, the site would reach the end of its permitted life, would no longer
4 accept waste, and would undergo formal closure. The County of Ventura and the cities that use the landfill (or
5 their haulers) would have to identify another location or locations for disposal of waste and delivery of
6 recyclable materials. After closure, the remaining permitted disposal capacity of the site, if any, would go
7 unused.

8 **ES.4 Environmental Issues**

9 **Land Use/General Plan Goals, Policies, and Programs**

10 The land use analysis evaluates consistency or compliance of the proposed project with adopted plans and
11 policies governing land use and development in the County of Ventura including the Ventura County General
12 Plan, the Ventura County Zoning Ordinance, and other applicable plans. The land use analysis also evaluates
13 the potential for the proposed project to introduce incompatible land uses relative to existing surrounding land
14 uses or activities.

15 The proposed project area is zoned as open space with a 160 acre minimum lot size. The proposed project
16 would result in the expansion of the existing SVLRC by 186 acres over open space land. The facilities
17 proposed within the expansion area are consistent with surrounding zoning and land uses. In addition, the
18 proposed project is consistent with all land use policies of the General Plan. As such the proposed project
19 would result in less than significant impacts to community character.

20 The proposed project would not remove any existing housing units. Therefore, no impacts to existing housing
21 would occur. In addition, the proposed project construction activities would generate employment
22 opportunities that could create a demand for additional housing. However, it is reasonable to assume that due
23 to the temporary nature of construction activities and the sufficient number of construction workers available
24 within Ventura County and the Los Angeles Metropolitan region, impacts on housing demands during project
25 construction would be less than significant. During proposed project operations, the workforce would increase
26 by a total of 150 permanent employees. Although the County of Ventura does not maintain statistics on the
27 amount of affordable housing available to lower-income families, recent inventory studies have shown that
28 there is not adequate lower-income inventory available throughout the County (personal communication,
29 Shelley Sussman 2009). As such and because the project would employ more than 30 new full-time
30 employees, the proposed project's impact on housing demand would be significant. Implementation of
31 Mitigation Measure LU-1, an in-lieu fee to support funding housing developments in the vicinity of Simi
32 Valley, would reduce impacts on housing demand to less than significant.

33 The project does not include and would not necessitate the expansion of critical public facilities, including
34 roads, water supply, sewers, or flood control facilities. No new roads or Watershed Protection District
35 facilities would be constructed as part of the project. Additionally, the proposed project does not include an
36 amendment to an adopted policy of the County that could establish a precedent or an accommodation for
37 further growth. As the project would not result in the expansion of public facilities or an amendment to a
38 County policy, impacts to growth inducement would be less than significant.

39 Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in inconsistencies with plans and policies
40 contained in the Ventura County General Plan. Without mitigation, some inconsistencies would exist with
41 regards to land use, air quality, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, and recreation;
42 however, implementation of the resources specific mitigation measures included in the various resource
43 sections contained in this EIR would ensure compliance with these plans and policies. As resource specific
44 measures would ensure consistency with the plans and policies contained in the Ventura County General Plan,
45 impacts on land use would be less than significant.

1 **Air Quality**

2 Emissions from proposed project construction and operation would exceed the VCAPCD daily nitrogen oxide
3 (NO_x) and reactive organic compounds (ROC) emission thresholds. Implementation of Mitigation Measure
4 AQ-1 would reduce emissions of ROC and NO_x from construction to less than significant levels during a
5 peak day of activity. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3 would reduce combustive emissions from
6 project operations; however, impacts would remain significant.

7 Project construction and operation would result in offsite ambient air pollutant concentrations that would
8 contribute to exceedances of the following standards: (1) 1-hour California Ambient Air Quality Standard
9 (CAAQS) for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂); (2) 24-hour CAAQS and National Ambient Air Quality Standard
10 (NAAQS) for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀); (3) annual CAAQS for PM₁₀; (4) the
11 24-hour NAAQS for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}); and (5) annual CAAQS and
12 NAAQS for PM_{2.5}. All other pollutant impacts would remain below significance levels. Implementation of
13 Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 would reduce combustive and fugitive dust emissions from
14 construction and operations. These mitigation measures would reduce proposed impacts to below the
15 NAAQS for 24-hour PM₁₀ and annual PM_{2.5}. However, all other construction and operational impacts
16 identified above would remain significant. Mitigation Measure AQ-5 would further reduce operations related
17 impacts, but since it is uncertain the extent to which this measure would offset overall project-related
18 vehicular emissions it is not possible to calculate what those reductions might be. these exceedances would
19 remain significant.

20 A Health Risk Assessment (HRA) estimated cancer and non-cancer effects to several population subgroups
21 (receptors), including residential, offsite occupational, and sensitive receptors. Project construction and
22 operations would not expose the public to significant levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs). Thus,
23 associated health risks to the public would be less than significant.

24 Project consistency with the AQMP requires an evaluation of the impact of a project on population growth
25 and air quality. Project construction would nominally affect population in Ventura County, as proposed
26 construction would occur for less than two years and many of the construction workers would originate from
27 the existing residents in the County. Project construction would produce nonattainment pollutants in the form
28 of combustive and fugitive dust (PM₁₀/PM_{2.5}) emissions. The 2007 AQMP proposes emission reduction
29 measures that are designed to bring the County into attainment of the ambient air quality standards. The
30 attainment strategies in this plan include mobile source control measures and clean fuel programs that are
31 enforced at the state and federal level on engine manufacturers and petroleum refiners and retailers and as a
32 result, project construction would have to comply with these control measures. The 2007 AQMP includes
33 projections of future emissions from construction activities. Project construction emissions would fit into
34 these future emission growth projections. The 2007 AQMP also assumes source compliance with adopted
35 VCAPCD rules. Project construction would comply with all applicable VCAPCD rules and regulations, such
36 as Rule 55 (Fugitive Dust). Lastly, this EIR analysis requires mitigations to minimize emission from project
37 construction (Mitigation Measure AQ-1 and AQ-2). Therefore, compliance with these requirements would
38 ensure that project construction would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air
39 quality plans.

40 The combined ambient impact of both construction and operational emissions would not generate significant
41 levels of fugitive dust. Project construction and operation would comply with VCAPCD Rule 55, Fugitive
42 Dust. The air quality analysis estimates that the proposed project, prior to mitigation, would reduce PM₁₀
43 emissions from uncontrolled levels by 50 percent, depending on the source type. Mitigation Measures AQ-2
44 and AQ-4, Additional Fugitive Dust Controls for Construction and Operations, respectively, would further
45 reduce fugitive dust emissions from these sources to 90 percent from uncontrolled levels. As a result,
46 implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2 and AQ-4 would further lower the ambient fugitive dust,
47 ensuring a less than significant impact.

1 Project construction would increase air pollutants due to the combustion of diesel fuel. The mobile and
2 intermittent nature of most emission sources would help to adequately disperse combustive emissions from
3 project construction. Additionally, since there are no sensitive receptors in close proximity to the project site,
4 project construction and operations would not expose the public to significant levels of odors. Project
5 operations would generate odorous emissions due to: (1) the combustion of diesel fuel in mobile equipment;
6 (2) the presence of municipal refuse and green waste; and (3) the decomposition of refuse and green waste.
7 Historically, the green waste operations have been the main source of odor emissions from the SVLRC. With
8 the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-6, effective use of the odor control system and implementation
9 of the Odor Control Plan in the future, project operations would not expose the public to significant levels of
10 odors.

11 The greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions generated by project construction and operations would incrementally
12 contribute to global climate change. Measures that reduce fossil fuel consumption of proposed construction
13 equipment would reduce GHG emissions. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would have this effect.
14 This is the case, as use of equipment that comply with the newest emission standards would have more fuel-
15 efficient engines compared to older equipment. Additionally, minimizing equipment idling time and using
16 alternatively-fueled equipment would reduce fossil fuel consumption and resulting GHG emissions compared to
17 unmitigated construction activities.

18 **Water Resources**

19 Expansion of the SVLRC would not result in significant impacts to groundwater quantity. Although the
20 Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD), the water purveyor for the SVLRC, would use limited
21 groundwater from the Las Posas Basin, the main source of water would be imported State San Joaquin Delta
22 water. Because a water availability letter would be submitted by CMWD with the proposed project
23 application, verifying that adequate water supplies are available; an updated water supply plan would be
24 included as part of a Master Development Plan; and the CMWD is considered a permanent source of water
25 (See Section 3.12, Water Supply); groundwater quantity impacts would be less than significant.

26 The proposed project has the potential to adversely affect groundwater quality in the Simi Valley
27 Groundwater Basin due to landfill leachate. However, the expanded waste disposal area would be fully lined
28 with regulation-compliant liner systems to prevent direct contact between the waste and soil or bedrock
29 Therefore, the potential for leachate contamination from expanded areas of the land fill would be less than
30 significant. In addition, groundwater quality impacts due to landfill gas, pesticides, oil field impact, and
31 laboratory contaminants would not become incrementally greater than the baseline condition as more waste is
32 placed into the landfill. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project to groundwater quality would be less than
33 significant.

34 The proposed project would not increase the net utilization of surface water in a hydraulic unit that is
35 overdrafted or adversely impact an overdrafted hydraulic unit. Surface runoff within the proposed CUP
36 boundary would continue to be collected at the perimeter of the fill area. This runoff, along with sheet flow
37 generated on the fill area itself, would continue to be diverted through a combination of lined and unlined
38 ditches, sediment traps, and slope benches, with the runoff culminating in six detention basins around the
39 perimeter of the landfill. Surface water would subsequently be discharged from these basins to downstream
40 drainage features. Drainage to these discharge points would accumulate within the proposed CUP project
41 boundary, but outside the proposed waste disposal area. Surface runoff would not be utilized for any project-
42 related purpose. Thus, proposed project impacts to surface water quantity would be less than significant.

43 During the proposed expansion period, contamination of surface waters could occur by various means
44 including: use of inadequately treated toe barrier liquids for dust control; ponding of water on the surface of a
45 landfill; washout of cover materials and waste due to inadequate drainage; and exposure of areas of bare earth
46 (from excavations) and loose soil (from stockpiling and covering activities) to erosion. These, in turn, could

1 result in incremental increases in debris loading and siltation of downstream drainage conveyances. However,
2 due to the implementation of the planned landfill drainage and cover provisions, and the limited precipitation
3 in the area, incremental project impacts from the proposed expansion would be less than significant.
4 Likewise, in addition to existing drainage and erosion control measures and water quality monitoring, a
5 system of six detention/sedimentation basins is proposed for removal of silt from stormwater runoff before
6 being discharged from the site. Except during peak flow conditions, sand particles 0.1 millimeters and greater
7 are expected to settle and not be transported downstream, thus preventing downstream siltation of drainages
8 and creeks. Use of existing and proposed drainage and erosion control measures would reduce incremental
9 increases in infiltration of surface water into the landfill waste mass, which increases leachate generation, and
10 erosion-related impacts. As such, incremental increases in water quality impacts due to erosion would be less
11 than significant.

12 However, recent on-site sampling data indicated that surface water quality objectives were exceeded for
13 nitrates, nitrites, sulfate, total dissolved solids, total suspended solids, specific conductance, and several metals,
14 including iron, lead, and mercury. Because 1) existing surface water quality at the SVLRC exceeds Basin Plan
15 and Federal EPA benchmark water quality objectives, thus contributing to impairment of the Calleguas Creek
16 watershed; 2) there is no indication that future landfill operations would be different from existing landfill
17 operations (i.e., contaminated runoff would continue to occur); 3) currently contaminated runoff from the
18 existing landfill would be co-mingled with runoff from the proposed expansion; and 4) toe barrier liquids
19 from the landfill, possibly containing groundwater-based pollutants, would continue to be used for dust
20 control, surface water quality impacts are considered significant. Mitigation Measures WR-1, Toe Barrier
21 Liquid Analysis by VCWPD, and WR-2, Stormwater Runoff Analysis by VCWPD, would be implemented to
22 reduce potentially significant impacts associated with the contaminated runoff to a less than significant level.

23 Project construction and operation would have the potential to result in increased flooding. The west end of
24 the northern expansion area is located within a 100-year flood plain, as designated by the Federal Emergency
25 Management Agency (FEMA) (FEMA 2008). This flood plain merges westward with the flood plain of upper
26 Alamos Canyon Creek. The proposed landfill expansion would fill the Alamos Canyon tributary creek and
27 substantially change the drainage performance of the drainage area, effectively eliminating the existing 100-
28 year flood storage capacity of the tributary creek. However, because surface runoff within this tributary
29 canyon (to Alamos Canyon Creek) would be controlled by project-related drainage features, including a
30 detention basin, flooding would not occur within the landfill expansion area during landfill operations,
31 resulting in less than significant impacts. In addition, because 100-year storm flow rates would be reduced to
32 less than or equal to existing flood flows, as a result of the detention basin, less than significant impacts would
33 occur with respect to contributing flood flow to Alamos Canyon Creek. The structural integrity of the
34 detention basin could be undermined by erosive floodwaters along Alamos Canyon Creek, resulting in
35 potentially significant flooding impacts. Mitigation Measure WR-3, Detention/Sedimentation Basin
36 Armoring, would be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts associated with the potential
37 erosive undercutting of the detention basin bank, due to 100-year flood along Alamos Canyon Creek to a less
38 than significant level. In addition, construction of the detention/sedimentation basin partially within the
39 floodplain could result in downstream erosion within Alamos Canyon Creek. Mitigation Measure WR-4,
40 Downstream Erosion Control Measures and/or Redesign of Detention/Sedimentation Basin, would be
41 implemented to reduce potential downstream erosion impacts.

42 **Biological Resources**

43 Impacts on biological resources were evaluated by determining the potential for the proposed project to
44 adversely affect: endangered, threatened, or rare plant or wildlife species; wetland habitat; migration
45 corridors; or locally important species or communities. No federally or state listed plants are known or
46 believed to occur on-site; however, limited potentially suitable habitat may be present within the project site
47 for several listed species including Braunton's milk vetch (*Astragalus brauntonii*), San Fernando Valley
48 spineflower (*Choizanthe parryi* var. *ferandina*), or Lyon's pentachaeta (*Pentachaeta lyoni*). Impacts to these

1 species, if present, would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce these
2 potentially significant impacts to less than significant. The proposed project would result in the removal of
3 249.4 acres of sage scrub habitat, and could affect the coastal California gnatcatcher, a federally listed bird
4 species, if present. Impacts to the coastal California gnatcatcher would be significant, but feasibly mitigated
5 by Mitigation Measure BIO-2, requiring protocol surveys for coastal California gnatcatcher to be conducted
6 prior to project-related removal of coastal scrub habitat. Construction of the proposed project could also
7 result in adverse impacts to nesting birds, which are protected under federal and state regulations. Impacts to
8 nesting birds would be significant, but feasibly mitigated by Mitigation Measure BIO-3, requiring either that
9 vegetation removal activities be conducted outside of bird breeding season (February 1 through August 15) or
10 that pre-grading surveys be conducted prior to ground disturbing activities in the vicinity of suitable nesting
11 habitat for resident or migratory bird species. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce
12 impacts on biological resources to less than significant.

13 Proposed project construction would also result in the permanent removal of approximately 0.05 acre of
14 marsh vegetation associated with two seeps in the southern part of the expansion area. Mitigation Measure
15 BIO-4 would ensure that the removed wetland habitat would be mitigated to less than significant.
16 Construction and operation of the proposed project would result in indirect impacts to Alamos and Brea
17 Canyons resulting from sediment washing into these areas from exposed surfaces adjacent to active landfill
18 areas. Since, the proposed project would require permits to control stormwater during both construction
19 (General Construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System [NPDES] permit) and operations
20 (Industrial Activities Storm Water General NPDES Permit) and measures would be built into the project to
21 control stormwater and sediment movement during operations, indirect impacts on offsite wetlands would be
22 less than significant.

23 Construction and operational activities could adversely affect wildlife migration in Brea and Alamos canyons
24 in a variety of ways including: impeding access from Brea to Alamos Canyons causing wildlife to move
25 across busy highways; increasing noise and nighttime lighting; and impacting adjacent vegetation and wildlife
26 habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-5, vector control methods, BIO-6, habitat enhancements
27 in and adjacent to the Alamos Canyon wildlife corridor, BIO-7, habitat enhancements along the channel in
28 Alamos Canyon, BIO-8, improvements or enhancements to the Alamos Canyon crossings and BIO-9, CUP
29 conditions, would ensure that significant impacts to wildlife migration would be less than significant.

30 Construction and operational activities would result in a substantial direct reduction in population and direct
31 long-term loss and degradation of habitat of two locally important plant species, Plummer's mariposa lily and
32 Catalina mariposa lily. Mitigation Measures BIO-6 and BIO-7 would reduce significant impacts to these two
33 locally important plant species. In addition, locally important wildlife species known to be residents or regular
34 visitors to the SVLRC site and vicinity and locally important raptor species known to forage within the
35 project would experience a substantial loss of foraging and breeding habitat (252.2 acres of native and
36 naturalized vegetation and habitat would be lost as a result of landfill development, 198.9 of these acres
37 would be permanently lost). Populations of species having smaller home ranges would also be reduced as a
38 result of the habitat loss. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 and Mitigation Measures BIO-12 and BIO-14 would
39 reduce significant impacts to locally important wildlife to less than significant.

40 Direct losses of over 252.1 acres of these habitats, including sage scrub (91.1 acres), chamise chaparral (8.1
41 acres), grassland (152.7 acres), and coast live oak woodland (0.2 acres) as a result of landfill expansion
42 represent a substantial reduction in these locally important communities, a long-term direct impact. In
43 addition to the direct loss of these locally important communities, expansion of the landfill would contribute
44 to the degradation of habitat quality in adjacent areas due to off-site effects as well as introduction and spread
45 of invasive non-native species in the project vicinity of the landfill. Examples include tree tobacco (*Nicotiana*
46 *glauca*), Russian-thistle (*Salsola tragus*), fountain grass (*Pennisetum setaceum*), and bull thistle (*Cirsium*
47 *vulgare*). Mitigation Measures BIO-13 and BIO-14 would reduce significant impacts on locally important
48 plant and wildlife communities to less than significant.

1 **Agricultural Resources**

2 The proposed project would convert approximately 165 acres of open space/rural designated farmland of local
3 importance to industrial/commercial uses. Although proposed project soils are considered locally important,
4 the site does not currently support agricultural operations and the agricultural viability of on-site soils is
5 dependent upon irrigation. However, the conversion and loss of locally important agricultural soils to
6 industrial/commercial uses would be a significant impact on agricultural resources. No feasible mitigation
7 measures would reduce or avoid the conversion of locally important farmland onsite while meeting the project
8 objectives. Thus, project impacts to agricultural resources would be significant.

9 Farmlands of local importance extend directly west of the project site in Alamos Canyon. The air quality
10 analysis in this EIR performed dispersion modeling analyses to estimate the ambient impact of project
11 construction and operational emissions. Review of the project dispersion modeling shows that unmitigated
12 project construction and operational emissions would produce a maximum ambient 24-hour PM₁₀ impact of
13 54 µg/m³, which would exceed the 24-hour PM₁₀ CAAQS of 50 µg/m³. The overwhelming majority of this
14 impact would occur from fugitive dust generated from proposed earth-moving activities and the operation of
15 mobile sources on paved and unpaved surfaces. The maximum ambient impact estimated for project PM₁₀
16 and therefore fugitive dust emissions would occur within the farmlands of local importance directly west of
17 the project site in Alamos Canyon. While the 24-hour ambient background concentration of fugitive dust
18 within these areas is not known, it is expected to be somewhat less than 49 µg/m³. Therefore, unmitigated
19 proposed construction and operation would increase ambient fugitive dust levels by more than 10 percent
20 from background levels to farmlands within one-half mile of the project site. Implementation of Mitigation
21 Measure AG-1 would reduce impact from fugitive dust to agricultural resources. However, mitigated
22 proposed construction and operation would increase ambient fugitive dust levels by more than 10 percent to
23 farmlands within one-half mile of the proposed project site, resulting in a significant impact.

24 **Visual Resources/Glare**

25 This analysis of potential visual effects of the proposed project was conducted using quantitative Federal
26 Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment and Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
27 Visual Resource Management techniques.

28 The project site is located within one-half mile of SR-118, which is designated as an Eligible Scenic
29 Highway. The proposed landfill footprint and elevations would be visible to individuals traveling eastbound
30 on SR-118 and thus obstruct important visual resources experienced from SR-118, resulting in a significant
31 impact to a scenic highway.

32 The visual impacts that would result from the project construction and operations would depend on the
33 specific location and elevation of the observer. Impacts on sensitive visual resources as viewed from Tierra
34 Rejada Park, South Crest Place (south of Tierra Rejada), and Big Sky Ranch Development would be less than
35 significant while impacts from Madera Road, Alamos Canyon Easterly Loop Trail, Alamos Canyon Trail, and
36 North Park Village Residential Development would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure
37 VIS-1, requiring a landscape plan, would ensure impacts on scenic areas/features from the Madera Road,
38 Alamos Canyon Easterly Loop Trail, and North Park Village Residential Development vantage points would
39 be reduced to a less than significant level. However, as the final landfill contour would extend above the
40 existing horizon defined by the Santa Susana Mountain ridgelines and due to the close proximity of the
41 viewer, impacts on visual resources from the Alamos Canyon Trail vantage point would be significant.

42 The proposed project would increase the number of lighting fixtures as a result of the need for illumination of
43 proposed structures and exterior areas, and for nighttime maintenance or operations. As such, the project
44 would introduce a substantial amount of new night light and glare, representing a significant change in the
45 level of night light illumination when compared to what is presently generated over the project site.

1 Furthermore, the proposed project does not include any specifications identifying the number, type, location,
2 and/or intensity of lighting infrastructure. Although existing topography would screen the proposed facilities
3 area from adjacent public view corridors, impacts on visual resources would be potentially significant.
4 Implementation of the project Lighting Plan (Mitigation Measures VIS-2 and VIS-3) would ensure that the
5 illumination and glare of exterior fixtures would be directed so as to reduce the potential for spillover light
6 onto surrounding areas. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts on visual resources would
7 be less than significant.

8 **Geologic Hazards/Mineral Resources/Paleontological Resources**

9 ***Geology and Seismic Hazards***

10 The geological analysis evaluated impacts of geohazards on project components that may result in substantial
11 damage to structures or infrastructure or expose people to substantial risk of injury. The project area and
12 immediate vicinity consist of generally rugged terrain. Canyon sides are steep and slopes of 1:1 (horizontal:
13 vertical) are common. Local relief ranges up to 250 feet. Earthquakes could result in impacts to proposed
14 project operations. The principal damaging effects of earthquakes consist of surface rupture, ground shaking,
15 and liquefaction. The closest large active fault is the Simi-Santa Rosa Fault, which trends east-west about
16 3,000 feet south of the landfill. Also, two potentially active faults, the Canada de la Brea and Strathearn faults,
17 traverse the landfill property. The Canada de la Brea fault is likely too short to generate an independent
18 earthquake of sufficient size to produce fault rupture, but may experience sympathetic (i.e., triggered) slip
19 during large earthquakes on nearby faults. This sympathetic slip, if it occurs, likely will be minor (i.e., on the
20 order of several centimeters). Therefore, impacts due to fault rupture hazard are considered less than
21 significant.

22 A large earthquake on a nearby or regional fault could cause severe ground shaking, resulting in damage to
23 project structures such as buildings, containment structures, leachate and gas collection facilities, and surface
24 drainage facilities. Ground shaking can also cause landfill settlement and trigger landslides. Cracking of the
25 containment structure could result in the exposure of buried waste. In extreme cases, human life may be
26 endangered. The potential for the occurrence of these impacts would be incrementally greater under the
27 proposed project than under existing conditions. In addition, the alluvial areas in canyon bottoms of the
28 project area would be subject to liquefaction in the event of severe seismically induced ground movement,
29 potentially resulting in damage to site structures such as buildings, containment structures, leachate and gas
30 collection facilities, and surface drainage facilities during project operations. However, design and
31 construction in accordance with this updated seismic design study, as well as all relevant federal, state, and
32 local regulations, would result in less than significant seismic impacts.

33 Subsidence is not expected to occur at the landfill site in association with extraction of oil, gas, or
34 groundwater. The project site is underlain by the Simi Oil Field. Previous oil and gas extraction has occurred
35 in the vicinity of the landfill; however, the oil production activities have been terminated and the proposed
36 project would preclude oil and gas drilling from within project boundaries. In addition, groundwater
37 extraction is not occurring in large quantities in the landfill vicinity. Subsidence within the waste footprint
38 would occur during landfill operations due to compaction and settlement of refuse over time. However, this
39 phenomenon is typical of all landfills and is anticipated during long-term landfill management. Also, no
40 permanent structures that might be adversely affected by subsidence-induced settlement would be constructed
41 on an area of engineered fill in the southern portion of the project site, where no refuse would be placed.
42 Therefore, subsidence impacts would be less than significant.

43 Superficial soils at the project site generally consist of clay loams, and the underlying Sespe Formation
44 contains beds of claystone. These clays could be expansive. Construction on expansive soils could result in
45 damage to foundations, roads, utilities, and other infrastructure as a result of the contracting and expanding
46 clays. However, development of the project site will be subject to the requirements of the Ventura County

1 Building Code, which is adopted from the California Building Code, Chapter 18, §1804.4 (ICC 2007) and
2 which requires mitigation of potential adverse effects of expansive soils for the proposed structures.
3 Compliance with these requirements would ensure that impacts relating to expansive soils would be less than
4 significant.

5 Slope instability could occur from excavation of soil from slopes within the project area during construction
6 activities. Likewise, slope instability could occur within the waste disposal area during project operations. The
7 stability and containment of the waste fill depends on the integrity of the final landfill slopes. Potential fill
8 slope stability impacts would be minimized or prevented through development of the proposed project in
9 compliance with regulatory requirements, implementation of proper landfill design and operating procedures,
10 and standard engineering geology and geotechnical engineering principles. Therefore, the proposed project
11 would result in less than significant slope stability impacts.

12 ***Mineral Resources***

13 The proposed landfill expansion area is located within a portion of the Canada de la Brea sections of the
14 former Simi Oil Field. There are no active oil wells, pipelines, or other facilities within the proposed
15 expansion or buffer areas. All wells have been abandoned. Proposed landfill expansion would preclude oil
16 and gas drilling from within proposed project boundaries; however, petroleum reserves beneath the site could
17 be accessed from remote locations, using directional (or slant) drilling techniques. Therefore, the proposed
18 project would not result in the permanent loss of availability of a known petroleum resource that would be of
19 future value to the region and the residents of the state. Mineral resource impacts would be less than
20 significant.

21 ***Paleontological Resources***

22 The occurrence of a number of previously recorded fossil sites in the middle member of the Sespe Formation
23 and of numerous additional sites in the project area, suggests a high potential for previously unrecorded fossil
24 sites and remains being encountered by earth-moving activities during excavation of the expansion area,
25 excavation of daily cover, and general grading of the site. As such, the proposed project would cause the loss
26 of scientifically important fossils and associated geologic data, resulting in a significant impact on
27 paleontological resources. Additional adverse impacts could potentially result due to unauthorized fossil
28 collecting by rock hounds, commercial collectors, and project personnel who would be afforded easier access
29 to fossiliferous exposures as a result of the proposed project. This impact could contribute to the loss of
30 highly important fossil specimens and associated scientific data, particularly from the middle member of the
31 Tertiary continental formation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, requiring a Paleontological
32 Mitigation Program, would mitigate many of the paleontological impacts of the proposed project. However,
33 since any such program would only recover a small sample of the total number of fossils disturbed by landfill
34 operations, the overall impact of the proposed project on paleontological resources would still be considered
35 significant.

36 ***Cultural Resources***

37 Impacts on cultural resources were evaluated by determining the potential for the proposed project to
38 adversely affect a resource listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP),
39 the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), or otherwise considered a unique or important
40 archaeological resource under CEQA. Due to a lack of potential for data recovery, none of the five prehistoric
41 sites described in Section 3.8.1.2.4 are considered a unique archaeological resource; nor are they considered
42 eligible for listing on the CRHR. Therefore, these sites are not historical resources for the purpose of CEQA.
43 Although no significant prehistoric sites have been recorded within the expansion area, the presence of
44 previously recorded prehistoric sites in close proximity show that regional site utilization during prehistoric
45 times did occur and unidentified, subsurface deposits may exist in some areas.

1 The Unrecorded Areas of Interest have no clear historic association and lack the potential for data recovery.
2 Therefore, these locations do not appear eligible for listing on the CRHR and are not considered to be
3 historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

4 The Wharton Ranch contains the only standing structures within the project site, but does not retain sufficient
5 integrity to qualify for the CRHR and is not considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.
6 However, the Wharton Ranch is considered to possess the potential for subsurface historical archaeological
7 deposits that would qualify the site for eligibility for the CRHR. Construction and operation of the proposed
8 project is not expected to occur in this area. However, any project-related clearing, grubbing, and grading in
9 this area would have the potential to result in a significant adverse effect on any significant archaeological
10 deposits.

11 Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3, would ensure that any impacts to subsurface
12 archaeological deposits during grading or construction activities would be less than significant.

13 Hazards

14 Hazards impacts were evaluated assessing the potential for fires, the release of hazardous materials/wastes,
15 and/or exposure to petroleum contaminated soil and associated soil gas from abandoned oil wells during
16 project construction and operation.

17 A potential exists for both surface and subsurface fires at the project site. The SVLRC is located in a high
18 wildfire hazard area, as it is surrounded by uncultivated, flammable vegetation in the form of coastal sage
19 scrub and grassland, shrubs with scattered chaparral, and oaks. However, similar to the existing County-
20 approved CUP 3142-7, Sections 14(1) and 56, the SVLRC would respond to fires through implementation of
21 the site specific Simi Valley Landfill Emergency Procedures Manual, which includes procedures to contain
22 potential fire hazards, such as use of on-site fire suppression capabilities. In addition, the SVLRC maintains a
23 fire response training program for site personnel. The SVLRC is surrounded by a fire break to reduce the
24 potential for off-site migration of landfill fires. With respect to subsurface fires, open flames typically do not
25 occur, thus, the potential for wildfires to be ignited on adjacent, off-site areas is low and the potential for
26 subsurface fire as a result of a surface fire is remote. Additionally, sufficient water pressure is available for
27 fire-fighting purposes at the SVLRC. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant fire
28 hazard impacts.

29 As a Class III landfill, the SVLRC does not accept hazardous waste as part of the municipal solid waste
30 disposed of in the landfill. This would not change due to the proposed project. As such, the proposed project
31 would not increase the potential health risk due to disposal of household hazardous wastes or other hazardous
32 materials in the landfill.

33 The SVLRC Expansion Project includes the construction and operation of a landfill gas to liquefied natural
34 gas (LNG) facility, located just north of the existing landfill gas flare station. The project also includes
35 storage, use, handling, and disposal of various hazardous materials including petroleum products used to fuel,
36 repair, and maintain the vehicles and household hazardous materials that would be collected and stored at the
37 SVECC for off-site disposal. Improper storage, handling, use, and disposal of these materials could result in
38 contamination of on-site soils, as well as adverse impacts to health and safety of on-site personnel. However,
39 hazardous materials would be stored, handled, and disposed in accordance with the Ventura County Uniform
40 Fire Code, as well as all other relevant Federal, State, and local regulations and standard best management
41 practices (BMPs) would be implemented. As such, the project would result in less than significant hazardous
42 materials and waste impacts.

43 Residual concentrations of petroleum products and hazardous substances may be present in on-site soil as a
44 result of oil and gas drilling operations. Abandoned oil wells are typically cut off 5 feet below grade and may

1 not be visible during excavation activities for landfill construction. Excavations could cause damage to the
2 abandoned oil well casings, potentially resulting in an oil and/or gas leak. The possibility of damage to the
3 abandoned oil wells during grading is a potentially significant impact. In addition, health and safety impacts
4 associated with a potential release of hazardous substances or petroleum products as a result of landfill
5 construction, in the vicinity of on-site abandoned oil wells, is a potentially significant impact. Implementation
6 of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3 would reduce potential health and safety impacts to on-site
7 personnel to less than significant levels.

8 Exposure to Valley Fever (*Coccidioidomycosis*) from soil disturbed at the landfill would pose a less than
9 significant impact. Landfill-related activities have the potential for release of *coccidioides immitis* spores at the
10 landfill. However, it is assumed that the majority of the population of Ventura County have already been
11 exposed to Valley Fever and would continue to be exposed from the various earthmoving activities that occur
12 throughout the region. Given the endemic nature of the disease and the number of earthmoving activities in
13 the County, it is not possible to attribute a specific case of Valley Fever to a specific earthmoving activity.
14 Furthermore, the SVLRC has an ongoing, aggressive dust control program to minimize dust at the landfill due
15 to vehicular movement, earthmoving, and other onsite activities. This dust program would continue with
16 implementation of the proposed project. The impact due to the potential for exposure to Valley Fever would
17 therefore be less than significant.

18 **Noise**

19 Noise impacts were evaluated to determine the levels of noise generated during construction and operation,
20 and the vibration that would be generated during project operation. Proposed project construction would not
21 result in an Equivalent Noise Level (Leq1H) of 55 A-weighted sound levels [dB(A)] or ambient noise level
22 plus 3dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM. Because of the topography of the
23 landfill site and the location of the proposed new support facilities within a bowl surrounded by hills on nearly
24 all sides, potential noise impacts from construction of those facilities within the bowl would be reduced
25 substantially by the barrier effect of the surrounding hills. The only direct line-of-sight between public areas and
26 the new facility construction location is through the canyon draining the landfill site to the south. The SR-118 is
27 the closest public location to the landfill. Because of the significant traffic-generated noise along the freeway
28 and the minimal time window within which they could be exposed, travelers on the freeway are not expected to
29 be impacted by construction related noise. Therefore, the construction noise increase impact of the project
30 would be less than significant. Similarly, the proposed project operation would not result in an Leq1H of 55
31 dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM
32 nor would it result in an Leq1H of 50 dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3dB(A), whichever is greater, during
33 any hour from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM. Therefore, the operational noise increase impact of the project would be
34 less than significant.

35 The project would not result in detectable vibration at sensitive land uses. The vibration associated with the
36 increased truck traffic is not likely to be detectable at the sensitive receptor locations. As indicated, the actual
37 increases in noise levels, estimated as L_{Aeq} , are relatively small and not likely to be perceived by receptors.
38 Similarly, air-borne vibrations from the incident increase in pressure would not be noticeable. Moreover,
39 vibrations transmitted through structural connection generally do not travel far and are considered
40 insignificant when contrasted to the existing vibration associated with present traffic on SR-118 and
41 associated traffic on surface streets. The project's incremental contribution to transportation-related ground-
42 transmitted vibration would be undetectable at locations adjacent to a roadway on which project vehicles
43 travel. Therefore, the impacts of operation vibration would be less than significant.

44 **Transportation/Circulation**

45 Traffic operations in the vicinity of the project were analyzed using an intersection capacity-based
46 methodology known as the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method for the signalized locations, per

1 County of Ventura standards. At stop-controlled intersections, the Highway Capacity Model (HCM)
2 methodology for unsignalized locations is used to calculate the average delay and corresponding LOS.
3 Freeway roadway segments were analyzed using the guidelines from the *Caltrans Guide for Preparation of*
4 *Traffic Impact Studies, State of California*, December 2002.

5 The Existing with project peak hour volumes were derived from the number of new trips generated by the
6 project added to existing intersection volumes identified in the previous section. The trip generation for the
7 proposed project was calculated using the existing SVLRC trip rates and accounting for the projected growth
8 in waste tonnage and associated truck trips from the SVLRC expansion.

9 The total project trip generation consists of the existing auto and trucks trips at the SVLRC, the projected
10 additional truck trips generated by the proposed project, and the relocation of the existing auto and truck trips
11 at the recycling/waste hauling yard from 195 W. Los Angeles Avenue to the SVLRC. The relocation of the
12 hauling yard requires that all auto and truck trips be shifted to the SVLRC and be counted as part of the
13 landfill trip generation during buildout.

14 The existing AM and PM peak hour counts show that the SVLRC is currently generating 54 AM and 18 PM
15 peak hour auto trips, and 162 AM and 30 PM peak hour passenger car equivalent (PCE) (one truck equals two
16 passenger vehicles) truck trips for a total of 216 AM peak hour PCE trips and 48 PM peak hour PCE trips. The
17 proposed project is forecast to generate an additional 217 AM and 40 PM peak hour PCE truck trips at the
18 project site at buildout. The relocation of the recyclable/waste hauling yard to the SVLRC will add 11 AM and
19 30 PM peak hour auto trips, and 118 AM and 30 PM peak hour PCE truck trips to the project site. The total new
20 trips from the proposed expansion is 562 AM peak hour PCE trips (246 inbound and 316 outbound) and 148
21 PM peak hour PCE trips (49 inbound and 99 outbound).

22 Using the Caltrans TIA guidelines, all of the study freeway segments are projected to continue to operate at
23 unacceptable LOS D and E during the AM peak hour, and two of the three study segments are projected to
24 continue to operate at unacceptable LOS D and E during the PM peak hour. However, the additional traffic
25 from the proposed project will not trigger a change in the LOS. Therefore the proposed project roadway
26 segment impact is considered less than significant.

27 According to the City of Simi Valley TIA guidelines, the results of the intersection analyses indicate that
28 impacts from the addition of the traffic from the proposed project will not reach a level considered significant
29 at any of the study area intersections. The LOS remains an acceptable C or better on all segments even with
30 project traffic.

31 The County of Ventura has noted that the addition of one PHT to the intersection of Somis Road and SR-118
32 is considered a significant impact. However, Caltrans is currently in the process of environmental review for a
33 project to improve safety conditions along State Route (SR) 118 at the intersections with SR 34 and Donlon
34 Road. Independently, the County of Ventura Public Works Agency, Transportation Department has developed
35 a separate project for realignment of Donlon Road. The effect of the State project is anticipated to improve the
36 LOS of this intersection to LOS 'D'. If the State project is delayed, the effect of the County project alone
37 should improve the LOS of this intersection to a satisfactory level. With the commitment to road
38 improvements that ensure that the impact will be reduced to an acceptable LOS in a reasonable period of time,
39 projected impacts of the proposed project would not adversely affect the LOS and would therefore be
40 considered less than significant.

41 **Water Supply**

42 Water supply impacts were evaluated to determine compliance of the domestic water available to the
43 development with applicable State Drinking Water Standards and the availability of a permanent source of
44 water supply. The project site is served by Ventura County Waterworks District No. 8, which is a retail

1 customer of the CMWD. The main source of water for District No. 8 is imported State San Joaquin Delta
2 water, supplied by CMWD, which originates from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
3 (MWD), as part of their State Water Project annual contract rights. At least a portion of the water supply
4 includes groundwater from the Las Posas Basin and recycled water from the City of Simi Valley Wastewater
5 Treatment Plant, which is supplied via an existing pipeline installed by the City of Simi Valley and the
6 CMWD.

7 The annual water demand for the project would be 174 acre-feet per year (Psomas 2007b). The project would
8 be served by the CMWD, which is considered by Ventura County to be a permanent source of water. A water
9 availability letter from Ventura County Waterworks District No. 8 would be submitted by CMWD with the
10 proposed project application, verifying that adequate water supplies are available. In addition, similar to
11 Condition #14 (Master Development Plan) of CUP-3142-7, imposed by Ventura County for the current phase
12 of landfill expansion, an updated water supply plan would be included as part of a Master Development Plan,
13 which is designed to ensure that the landfill is operated in an environmentally safe manner and to mitigate any
14 significant avoidable environmental impacts identified in the EIR. The water supply plan would describe
15 improvements to be made to assure adequate potable and non-potable water for landfill operations, dust
16 control, fire protection, landscaping, human consumption, and hygiene. Therefore, impacts to water supply
17 would be less than significant.

18 **Waste Treatment/Disposal**

19 Individual sewage disposal system impacts were evaluated to determine conformance of the system with the
20 requirements of the LARWQCB Basin Plan concerning development utilizing septic systems and with the
21 applicable sections of the Ventura County Building Code, enforced by the Ventura County Environmental
22 Health Division.

23 The proposed project would result in an increase in generation of domestic wastewater due to the increased
24 number of employees. Additional industrial wastewater would be generated from proposed truck and
25 equipment washing facilities. In total, the proposed project is expected to generate an average of 7,000
26 gallons of wastewater and a peak (2,500 gallons of domestic and 4,500 gallons of industrial) per day and a
27 peak of 24,500 gallons of wastewater (8,750 gallons of domestic and 15,750 gallons of industrial) per day.

28 The Ventura County Environmental Health Division determined that because the public sewer system with
29 capacity for additional wastewater load is not available within one-half mile of the SVLRC the proposed
30 project would meet exception condition #3 of the Ventura County Sewer Policy (Personal communication,
31 Melinda Talent 2008). The proposed project is expected to meet the remaining two Sewer Policy exception
32 conditions. Due to the size of the facility, the proposed project is expected to meet exception condition #1.
33 The proposed project would be required to comply with Exception condition #2 prior to project approval. As
34 such, the proposed project would be expected to meet the three Ventura County Sewer Policy exception
35 conditions and would not be required to connect to a public sewer system.

36 The California Water Code, Chapter 4, Article 5, sets forth criteria for regulating individual disposal systems.
37 While the LARWQCB has delegated local health or public works departments jurisdiction to permit septic
38 systems, such as those for single family dwellings, the Board would likely take jurisdiction over permitting
39 the proposed on-site wastewater treatment plant under an individual Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR)
40 permit. The level of treatment required and permitted reuse would be specified in the WDR issued by the
41 LARWQCB. As such, the proposed project would conform with the requirements of the LARWQCB's Basin
42 Plan concerning development utilizing individual sewer systems (LARWQCB 1994). The individual sewer
43 system proposed is a package treatment plant, not a septic system and would not involve discharges to the
44 ground. In addition, the proposed on-site wastewater treatment facility must meet operation and maintenance
45 guidelines required by the Ventura County Environmental Health Division; and meet requirements outlined in
46 the Ventura County Building Code. The proposed project would require a revised permit issued by the

LARWQCB to allow commingled treated leachate and treated wastewater to be beneficially reused as discussed above. Issuance of these permits and compliance with applicable State and County regulations with respect to design and operation of the treatment plant would reduce potential impacts from on-site sewage disposal to a level considered less than significant.

A capacity study was completed to assess the future landfill capacity in Ventura County as it would be affected by the proposed project. The proposed project would provide substantial additional waste disposal capacity. The results of the capacity study indicated that the SVLRC would result in the County reaching its 15 year capacity in approximately 2060 based on the assumptions used in the model. As such, the proposed project would not substantially impact the demand for solid waste disposal capacity in Ventura County such that there would be less than 15 years of disposal capacity available for county disposal. Thus, impacts to waste treatment and disposal would be less than significant.

Recreational Facilities

The analysis of potential impacts to recreational facilities identified and evaluated the type and quantity of recreational facilities within the project's area of influence to determine if the needs of the proposed project could be adequately served by existing resources, or if the proposed project would result in an increase in demand for recreational facilities. Additionally, proposed trail/corridor systems and park sites within the area of influence were evaluated to determine whether the proposed project would preclude future development of these recreational facilities. The nearest local or regional park/facility is located approximately 0.8 miles from the proposed project site and two regional trails/corridors are located within a two-mile radius of the proposed project site, including the Arroyo Simi Bike Path and the Mt. McCoy Trail. No local or regional parks/facilities or regional trails/corridors are located within the proposed project area thus, no existing facilities would be directly impacted by the proposed project. However, because project-related employees and worker households would increase the demand for local and regional parks/facilities and trails/corridors, and no ordinance is in place to require payment of fees or dedication of land, the proposed project would create a significant impact on local and regional parks/facilities and trails/corridors. Implementation of Mitigation Measure REC-1 (payment of in lieu fees for local parks/facilities), REC-2 (payment of in lieu fees for regional parks/facilities), and REC-3 (dedication of public easements for future trails) would ensure that impacts on local and regional parks/facilities and trails/corridors would be less than significant.

Two planned multi-purpose trails are located in the project vicinity, including the Alamos Canyon Trail and the Alamos Canyon Easterly Loop Trail. As the Alamos Canyon Easterly Loop Trail is not located within the proposed project area, the project would not directly impede the future development of this regional trail/corridor. However, the Alamos Canyon Trail would be located within the western portion of the proposed project area. In addition, a planned 20-acre community park site is located within the project site. Although the exact location of the facility has not been determined, it is reasonable to assume the community park would be located within the proposed 516-acre buffer area around the disposal footprint. As the proposed project does not include provisions for on-site recreational facilities, the proposed development would impede future development of recreation parks/facilities and regional trails resulting in a significant impact on recreational resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measures REC-1 through REC-3, would ensure that impacts on planned recreational facilities and multi-use trails would be less than significant.

ES.5 Cumulative Impacts

Land Use/General Plan Goals, Policies, and Programs

Over the years, the County has developed consistency with the General Plan and site zoning regulations, ensuring consistency with land use/density designations to minimize impacts on surrounding areas. Similarly, existing facilities within the project vicinity have been modified as necessary to ensure proposed land

1 use/density designations are consistent with their respective land use plan and site zoning designations. As the
2 proposed project would be consistent with zoning and General Plan land use policies, and would be
3 compatible with surrounding land uses, impacts on community character would be less than significant.
4 Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative contribution to cumulative
5 impacts on land use.

6 The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects would not cause growth (i.e., new housing
7 generators) that exceeds project levels for the year of proposed project buildout (2050) that would result in
8 adverse impacts on housing demands. It is expected that local workers will fill most of the construction and
9 operations jobs associated with these projects and would not require relocation within the region that would
10 require new development of housing. Since the proposed project would have no impacts on existing housing,
11 it is not necessary to analyze the proposed project's contribution to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable
12 impacts on existing housing.

13 **Air Quality**

14 The region of analysis for cumulative effects on air quality is the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB).
15 However, the most severe impacts under the proposed project in the context of past, present, and reasonably
16 foreseeable projects would occur within the areas adjacent to the proposed project, including unincorporated
17 portions of Ventura County, the City of Simi Valley, and the City of Moorpark.

18 The Ventura County region does not attain the national and state ambient air quality standards for ozone (O₃),
19 respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀), and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). These pollutant nonattainment
20 conditions within the project region are considered to be cumulatively significant. Foreseeable future projects
21 in the vicinity of SVLRC with overlapping construction schedules with the proposed project may add to the
22 emission levels and ambient concentrations around the landfill. Impacts of multiple construction projects,
23 along with the proposed project, could be cumulatively considerable. In addition, project construction and
24 operations would produce emissions that would exceed the VCAPCD daily ROC and NO_x emission
25 thresholds for each modeled year. Additionally, emissions from project construction and operation would
26 contribute to exceedances of the following standards: (1) 1-hour CAAQS for NO₂; (2) 24-hour CAAQS and
27 NAAQS for PM₁₀; (3) annual CAAQS for PM₁₀; (4) 24-hour NAAQS for PM_{2.5}, and (5) annual CAAQS and
28 NAAQS for PM_{2.5}. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 would reduce proposed
29 impacts to below the NAAQS for 24-hour PM₁₀ and annual PM_{2.5}. However, all other criteria pollutant
30 impacts identified above would remain significant and unavoidable. Existing and future project construction
31 and operational activities would add additional air emission burdens to these significant levels of project
32 emissions. Thus, the proposed project with mitigation would produce cumulatively considerable and
33 unavoidable contributions to O₃, NO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} levels.

34 With regard to ambient levels of TACs due to the relatively rural setting of the area of influence, impacts
35 from cumulative projects adjacent to the project site are cumulatively less than significant. Emissions of
36 TACs from project construction and operation would marginally increase cancer risks and non-cancer effects
37 in proximity to the project site. Existing and future project construction and operational activities would
38 nominally combine with these project impacts at low levels, due to their relatively long distance from the
39 project site. As a result, the project construction and operational activities would produce less than
40 cumulatively considerable impacts to levels of TACs and public health effects.

41 Fugitive dust from project construction and operations would exceed the 24-hour PM₁₀ CAAQS. However,
42 this maximum impact is predicted to occur on the SVLRC property line and proposed ambient PM₁₀ impacts
43 would quickly decrease in magnitude with distance from the SVLRC facility. Therefore, project construction
44 and operation would not generate a cumulatively considerable impact to levels of fugitive dust.

1 Odorous emissions from project construction would occur due to the combustion of diesel fuel. The mobile
2 and intermittent nature of most emission sources would adequately disperse such emissions during
3 construction. In addition, there are no sensitive receptors in close proximity to the project site. Odorous
4 emissions during project operation would result from diesel fuel emissions from mobile equipment, municipal
5 refuse and green waste, and the decomposition of refuse and green waste. Implementation of Mitigation
6 Measure AQ-6 would ensure that the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact from
7 odorous emissions.

8 Scientific evidence indicates a correlation between increasing global temperatures/climate change over the
9 past century and human induced GHG emissions. These and other environmental changes have potentially
10 negative environmental, economic, and social consequences around the globe. Climate change, as it relates to
11 man-made GHG emissions, is by nature a global impact. Thus, the issue of global climate change is a
12 cumulative impact and an appreciable impact on global climate change would occur when GHG emissions
13 from a project combine with GHG emissions from other man-made activities on a global scale. The approved
14 and proposed projects would contribute to the existing cumulative air quality conditions. The proposed project
15 would produce GHG emissions that would exceed levels of GHG emissions produced from the existing
16 SVLRC. These project increases of GHG emissions would incrementally contribute to global climate change.
17 Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-3, and AQ-6 would reduce the project's contribution to
18 global climate change. The significance of the impacts in the absence of established criteria is not determined.

19 **Water Resources**

20 Past projects have not contributed to groundwater withdrawal from the Las Posas Groundwater Basin, as the
21 Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD), the water purveyor for these past projects, has not historically
22 used the Las Posas Groundwater Basin for its water supplies. However, the CMWD intends to initiate
23 groundwater pumping from this basin, to supplement its supplies from the State Water Project. Therefore,
24 some present and most reasonably foreseeable projects, including the proposed project, would receive water
25 from the CMWD, thus contributing to groundwater withdrawals from the Las Posas Groundwater Basin.
26 Because a water availability letter would be submitted by CMWD with the proposed project application,
27 verifying that adequate water supplies are available; an updated water supply plan would be included as part
28 of a Master Development Plan; and the CMWD is considered a permanent source of water (See Section 3.12,
29 Water Supply); groundwater quantity impacts associated with proposed expansion of the SVLRC would be
30 less than significant. However, because of the uncertainty associated with future groundwater withdrawals by
31 other users within the already overdrafted Las Posas basin, the project's contribution to cumulative effects
32 would potentially result in a significant cumulative impact on groundwater quantity..

33 Numerous past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the Simi Valley Groundwater Basin that
34 use and/or dispose of hazardous materials/waste and/or bulk petroleum products, including the existing
35 SVLRC, could further contribute to groundwater quality degradation. However, because of the poor water
36 quality in the basin, groundwater from the Simi Valley Groundwater Basin is generally not extracted for
37 beneficial uses. Impacts to water quality impacts would not become incrementally greater if the existing
38 landfill were expanded. Therefore, the cumulative impact to groundwater quality is less than significant and
39 the contribution of the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

40 Past projects that diverted surface waters for project related beneficial uses may have increased the net
41 utilization of surface water in a hydraulic unit that is overdrafted or adversely impacted an overdrafted
42 hydrologic unit. Similarly, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects may increase the net utilization
43 of surface water in an overdrafted hydraulic unit. The proposed landfill expansion would not increase the net
44 utilization of surface water in a hydraulic unit that is overdrafted or adversely impact an overdrafted
45 hydrologic unit. Therefore, no cumulative impacts would occur in association with surface water quantity.

1 Construction and operation of the proposed project would use existing and proposed drainage and erosion
2 control measures, reducing incremental increases in infiltration of surface water, which increases leachate
3 generation, and erosion-related impacts. However, similar to the proposed project, numerous past, present,
4 and reasonably foreseeable projects within local drainages and creeks would contribute runoff and pollutants,
5 potentially resulting in adverse surface water quality impacts. Although existing surface water flows and
6 water quality on and proximal to the site have been monitored on a regular or periodic basis, in accordance
7 with Water Quality Order No. 97-03-DWQ, sampling data indicate that stormwater runoff is not in
8 compliance with water quality objectives established in the Basin Plan, including associated TMDLs, nor in
9 compliance with Federal EPA benchmarks. Such contaminated runoff is incrementally contributing to water
10 quality impacts within the Calleguas Creek watershed. A representative with the LARWQCB indicated that it
11 is common for stormwater runoff at commercial and industrial facilities located throughout RWQCB Region
12 4, the Los Angeles Region (as established by the State Water Resources Control Board), to exceed Federal
13 EPA water quality benchmarks (Lee, personal communication 2009). Therefore, past, present, and
14 reasonably foreseeable projects located within the watershed would similarly contribute to adverse water
15 quality impacts within the Calleguas Creek watershed, which is considered an impaired water body due to
16 water column and sediment toxicity, organophosphate pesticides in water, and chlorpyrifos in fish tissue. The
17 cumulative impact is significant and the contribution of the proposed project is cumulatively considerable.
18 Past projects may have resulted in increased flooding in Arroyo Simi, primarily as a result of increased
19 paving, less permeable surfaces, and associated increased surface runoff. Projects that did not include
20 detention basins to retard project related increased surface flows would be especially prone to downstream
21 flooding contributions. The proposed project would result in an increase in surface water runoff. However,
22 prior to construction of the proposed project, proposed drainage facilities and improvements to existing
23 facilities would provide stormwater management capabilities equivalent to those of existing conditions and
24 those at final development of the expanded landfill as well as control surface runoff to Alamos Canyon Creek
25 As a result, flooding would not occur within the landfill expansion area during landfill operations. A flooding
26 analysis completed by Hall & Foremen, Inc. (2009) indicated that future grading improvements affecting a
27 tributary canyon to Alamos Canyon Creek that would be filled by the expansion project should not negatively
28 impact the upstream or downstream 100-year floodwater surface of Alamos Canyon Creek. However,
29 potentially increased surface flow velocities, as a result of partial infringement of the detention/sedimentation
30 basin on the floodplain, could result in downstream erosion within Alamos Canyon Creek. Implementation of
31 downstream erosion control features, in coordination with the VCWPD, Floodplain Management Division,
32 and/or redesign of the basin such that it does not infringe on the floodplain, would reduce potential
33 downstream erosion during 100-year flood events, such that impacts would be less than significant. There are
34 no other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects that include construction within the Alamos Canyon
35 Creek floodplain that might contribute to increase flood-induced erosion. Therefore, the cumulative impact is
36 less than significant and the contribution of the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

37 **Biological Resources**

38 The area of influence for cumulative projects with respect to biological resources is limited within one mile of
39 the project site. All listed projects occurring within one mile of the project area and north of SR-118 are located
40 within an urban landscape and, therefore, are unlikely to add cumulative adverse impacts to native habitat
41 communities and wildlife. Urban projects that include vegetation removal during nesting season in the
42 vicinity may adversely impact nesting birds. In addition, cumulative projects with regards to wildlife
43 corridors are those located within the Santa Monica Mountains-Tierra Rejada-Santa Susana Mountain Range
44 wildlife corridors. Cumulative impacts on biological resources within wildlife corridors may result from the
45 combined incremental impact of increases in removal of high quality native habitat.

46 The proposed project would result in significant impacts to: the California coastal gnatcatcher and nesting
47 birds; about 2,125 square feet (0.05 acre) of marsh vegetation associated with two seeps in the southern part
48 of the expansion area; movement corridors and important habitat in Alamos and Brea canyons adjacent to the
49 project site; and locally important plants, wildlife, and communities. Impacts to these biological resources

would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14. Because adjacent projects occur in urban settings that are already partially or fully developed, the cumulative impact to Impacts BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-4 are less than significant and the contribution of the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable. With implementation of these measures, the cumulative impact on wildlife corridors (Impact BIO-3 is potentially significant and the contribution of the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

Agricultural Resources

Cumulative impacts on agricultural resources may result from the combined incremental conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses within Ventura County. Past development has converted and/or displaced agricultural land within the cumulative region of influence. Present and reasonably foreseeable projects located on the periphery of the urban/rural boundary, would convert agricultural lands to urban uses. Together with past development, they would incrementally contribute to cumulative adverse impacts on agricultural resources. Cumulative impacts on agricultural resources due to dust may result from the combined incremental impact of increases in dust on agricultural parcels. Present and reasonably foreseeable projects located on or within a half-mile of the property that currently are in or suitable for agricultural production could experience a 10 percent or greater increase in dust on agricultural parcels.

The proposed project would convert approximately 165 acres of open space/rural designated farmland of local importance to industrial/commercial uses. The resulting the direct loss of locally important farmland to non-agricultural uses would be a significant impact, and the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts associated with the loss of agricultural soils. Regarding impacts related to dust, unmitigated proposed construction and operations would increase ambient fugitive dust levels by more than 10 percent from background levels to farmlands within one-half mile of the proposed project site, thereby resulting in a significant impact. Mitigation Measure AG-1 would reduce these impacts, but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts associated with increases of dust on agricultural resources.

Visual Resources and Glare

Past development in the project vicinity and surrounding areas has transformed the natural setting to create an urbanized landscape. In this area, construction of residential communities, industrial facilities, and commercial centers has eliminated public views of natural features, including undulating ridgelines, canyons, expansive grasslands, and oak/riparian woodlands. Probable future projects would contribute to cumulative impacts on visual resources are projects due to the conversion of undeveloped, natural areas to industrial/commercial development, obstruction of public views along the SR-118 scenic view corridor, and light/glare. These sites also include important visual qualities experienced from public viewpoints that would be compromised when developed.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would obstruct scenic views of the Santa Susana Mountain Range from the SR-118 scenic viewshed resulting in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts associated with obstruction of important public views from the SR-118 scenic viewshed. In addition, the proposed project would result in significant impacts to visual resources as viewed from Madera Road, Alamos Canyon Easterly Loop Trail, elevated North Park Village residential lots, and Alamos Canyon Trail. Implementation of Mitigation Measure VIS-1 would reduce impacts to these scenic features to a less than significant level. However, as the final landfill contour would extend above the existing horizon defined by the Santa Susana Mountain ridgelines and due to the close proximity of the viewer, impacts on visual resources from the Alamos Canyon Trail vantage point would be significant. Therefore, cumulative impacts on scenic areas/features from the Alamos Canyon Trail would be cumulatively considerable.

1 Past development in the project vicinity and surrounding areas have created sources of light and glare and
2 resulted in changes in ambient illumination levels in adjacent areas. Because of the lighting policies and
3 standards that are currently implemented by local jurisdictions to minimize exterior light illumination, the
4 contributions of present and reasonably foreseeable projects to cumulative light/glare impacts in the area will
5 be limited. The proposed project would introduce a substantial amount of new night light and glare,
6 representing a significant change in the level of night light illumination when compared to what is presently
7 generated over the project site. Impacts would be potentially significant; however implementation of the
8 project Lighting Plan (Mitigation Measures VIS-2 and VIS-3) would result in a less than significant
9 cumulative contribution to cumulative light/glare impacts.

10 ***Geologic Hazards/Mineral Resources/Paleontological Resources Geology and Seismic***
11 ***Hazards***

12 Past projects, including projects may have been impacted by geologic hazards, including fault rupture, severe
13 seismically induced ground shaking, liquefaction, subsidence, expansive soils, and landslides/mudslides. Past
14 development has increased the amount of infrastructure, structural improvements, and number of people
15 working in the Simi Valley area (i.e., the cumulative geographic scope) and has placed commercial,
16 industrial, and residential structures and their occupants in areas that are susceptible to geologic hazards.
17 Thus, these developments have had the effect of increasing the potential for geologic hazards to result in
18 damage to property and injury to people. Similarly, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects,
19 including the existing SVLRC, may be impacted by geologic hazards. However, past, present, and reasonably
20 foreseeable future projects (including the proposed project) would not change the risk of these geologic
21 hazards. The proposed landfill expansion area is not located within a: 1) State of California designated
22 Alquist-Priolo Special Fault Study Zone; 2) County of Ventura designated Fault Hazard area; or 3) County of
23 Ventura designated Potential Fault Hazard Area. The nearest large active fault is the Simi-Santa Rosa Fault,
24 which trends east-west about 3,000 feet south of the landfill. The on-site, potentially active Canada de la Brea
25 Fault may experience sympathetic (i.e., triggered) slip during large earthquakes on nearby active faults. This
26 sympathetic slip, if it occurs, likely will be minor (i.e., on the order of several centimeters). In addition,
27 alluvial areas in canyon bottoms would be subject to liquefaction in the event of severe seismically induced
28 ground movement, potentially resulting in damage to site structures such as buildings, containment structures,
29 leachate and gas collection facilities, and surface drainage facilities. However, impacts are site-specific and
30 relate primarily to construction techniques. In addition, the expanded landfill, as well as all cumulative
31 projects would be designed and constructed in accordance with seismic design studies, as well as all relevant
32 State and County regulations. Therefore, the cumulative impact is less than significant and the contribution of
33 the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

34 Past projects may have been constructed over known or unknown petroleum resources, thus precluding oil
35 drilling from within project boundaries. Past projects may have also resulted in displacement of oil wells that
36 have produced oil from the Simi Valley area. However, modern directional (or slant) drilling techniques have
37 allowed access to oil reserves from remote locations; therefore, past industrial and commercial development
38 have not substantially reduced access to oil reserves in the Simi Valley area. Similarly, present and
39 reasonably foreseeable future projects will not preclude continued development of the Simi Valley area, as
40 these project sites could be accessed from remote locations, using directional drilling techniques. Although
41 previous oil and gas extraction has occurred in the vicinity of the landfill, most of the production activities
42 have been terminated at the project site, as well as within the encompassing Simi Valley. In addition,
43 groundwater extraction is not occurring in large quantities in the landfill vicinity or the encompassing Simi
44 Valley Groundwater Basin. Therefore, cumulative subsidence is not expected to occur in association with
45 extraction of oil, gas, or groundwater. The cumulative impact is less than significant and the contribution of
46 the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

Mineral Resources

Past projects, including projects have been constructed over known or unknown petroleum resources, thus precluding oil drilling from within project boundaries. Past projects may have also resulted in displacement of oil wells that have produced oil from the Simi Valley area. However, modern directional (or slant) drilling techniques have allowed access to oil reserves from remote locations; therefore, past industrial and commercial development have not substantially reduced access to oil reserves in the Simi Valley area. Similarly, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects will not preclude continued development of the Simi Valley area, as these project sites could be accessed from remote locations, using directional drilling techniques.

Proposed landfill expansion would preclude oil and gas drilling from within proposed project boundaries. However, petroleum reserves beneath the site, as well as beneath other cumulative projects listed in Table 4.1-1, could be accessed from remote locations, using directional (or slant) drilling techniques. Therefore, the proposed project, as well as cumulative projects in the Simi Valley area, would not result in the permanent loss of availability of a known petroleum resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state. Because of modern oil and gas drilling techniques, the cumulative impact is less than significant and the contribution of the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

Paleontological Resources

Past projects, including may have destroyed paleontological resources. Construction activities associated with present and reasonably foreseeable future projects would potentially require excavation into portions of the Sespe Formation with potentially significant vertebrate paleontological resources. Therefore, such projects may result in the destruction of paleontological resources. The proposed project would result in ground disturbances within areas of high paleontological sensitivity. Based on the relative uniqueness of land mammal fossils found in this area, the potential disturbance to these paleontological resources by the proposed project would be significant, prior to mitigation. Therefore, the incremental effect of the proposed project on paleontological resources prior to mitigation would be cumulatively considerable when considered in conjunction with past projects and related present and future projects.

Cultural Resources

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development that would contribute to cumulative impacts on cultural resources includes projects that would have the potential for ground disturbance in the region of analysis. Those projects that have the potential to modify and/or demolish structures over 50 years old have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on historical architectural resources. Projects that involve grading of intact, natural landforms have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on archaeological resources. Reasonably foreseeable future cumulative projects would potentially disturb unknown, intact subsurface prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. Although much of the area has been previously disturbed, there is potential for related infill projects to potentially contribute to this impact. Discretionary review of incremental projects would minimize impacts on cultural resources, as local policies encourage the avoidance and protection of archaeological resources. However, impacts on cultural resources associated with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable buildout would be cumulatively considerable. If significant archaeological deposits are discovered during grading or construction, the project would have a significant impact on archaeological resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3, would ensure that impacts to subsurface archaeological deposits would be less than significant. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative contribution to cumulative impacts on archaeological resources. Since the proposed project would have no impacts on historical resources, it is not necessary to analyze the proposed project's contribution to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable impacts on historical resources.

1 **Hazards**

2 Past projects may have been impacted by hazards, including fire, hazardous materials/waste spills, and soil
3 contamination/soil gas associated with former oil wells. Past development has had the effect of increasing the
4 potential for hazards to result in damage to property and injury to people. Similarly, present and reasonably
5 foreseeable future projects, including the existing SVLRC, may be impacted by fire, hazardous
6 materials/waste, and oil field hazards.

7 The potential for wildfires to be ignited on adjacent, off-site areas is low and impacts are considered less than
8 significant. The expanded landfill, as well as all cumulative projects would be required to comply with fire
9 prevention regulations established by the Ventura County Fire Protection District. Therefore, the cumulative
10 impact is less than significant and the contribution of the proposed project is less than cumulatively
11 considerable.

12 The proposed SVLRC expansion includes the storage, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials and
13 hazardous waste. Improper storage, handling, and disposal of these substances could result in contamination
14 of on-site soils, as wells as adverse impacts to health and safety of on-site personnel. Expanded landfill
15 operations, as well as all cumulative projects would be required to comply with fire prevention regulations
16 established by the Ventura County Uniform Fire Code, as well as all other relevant County, State, and Federal
17 regulations. Therefore, the cumulative impact is less than significant and the contribution of the proposed
18 project is less than cumulatively considerable.

19 Residual concentrations of petroleum products and hazardous substances may be present in on-site soil as a
20 result of historic oil and gas drilling operations. Grading and landfill operations in the immediate vicinity of
21 the existing oil wells could create significant adverse health and safety impacts, such as organic vapor
22 emissions and exposure of contaminated soils. In addition, elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons
23 are present beneath oil field service roads, to a depth of approximately two feet. Grading in the vicinity of
24 these roads could similarly result in adverse health and safety impacts. Excavations could cause damage to the
25 abandoned oil well casings, potentially resulting in an oil and/or gas leak. The possibility of damage to the
26 abandoned oil wells during grading is considered a potentially significant, but mitigable impact. In addition,
27 health and safety impacts associated with a potential release of hazardous substances or petroleum products as
28 a result of landfill construction, in the vicinity of on-site abandoned oil wells, is considered a potentially
29 significant, but mitigable impact. Expanded landfill operations, as well as cumulative projects that are located
30 in the vicinity of active or abandoned oil wells, would similarly result in potentially significant health and
31 safety impacts in the event that grading and construction is completed in proximity to active or former oil
32 field infrastructure. However, such health and safety impacts are localized in nature and specific to each
33 cumulative project site. Therefore, the cumulative impact is less than significant and the contribution of the
34 proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

35 Exposure to Valley Fever from soil disturbed at the landfill would pose a less than significant impact because
36 ground-disturbing activities are considered baseline and represent a continual source of spores that contribute
37 to the low number of Valley Fever cases reported each year; and a major ground-disturbing event (i.e., large
38 earthquake) is required to release a large number of spores over a wide area wide enough for a significant
39 outbreak of Valley Fever to occur. Expanded landfill operations, as well as cumulative projects, would result
40 in less than significant impacts. Therefore, the cumulative impact is less than significant and the contribution
41 of the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

42 **Noise**

43 The geographic scope for cumulative noise impacts is the vicinity of the SVLRC and local roadways that
44 would be used by waste vehicles. Projects that could contribute to cumulative construction noise and vibration
45 impacts include demolition, grading and construction projects in the vicinity of the proposed project. Those

1 that could contribute to operational noise and vibration impacts include projects in the vicinity of SVLRC that
2 could exceed the standards of Ventura County Noise Policy 2.16.2-1(4).

3 Virtually all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects will make some incremental contribution
4 to noise, at least during construction and most likely during operations, as well. Residential development
5 results in noise from vehicles, household occupants (people and pets), and associated lawn and garden
6 equipment, recreational vehicles, mechanized toys, etc. Commercial development involves vehicle traffic
7 noise as well as noise associated with the presence of people and the loading and unloading of goods.
8 Industrial development involves noise associated with vehicles, loading and unloading of goods, industrial
9 processes including release of pressure, clanging of metal on metal, whistles, and equipment and vehicle
10 noise. The cumulative effect of development projects over time has been to overall increase the noise levels in
11 developed areas to levels considerably above pre-development ambient levels. Therefore, the cumulative
12 noise impact of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects has been considerable.

13 The proposed project would cause increases in noise of less than one dB (A) over current ambient levels at all
14 analyzed locations. Since three dB (A) is considered the threshold of audibility for a person with normal
15 hearing in a typical setting, the incremental noise from the proposed project would be considerably below the
16 threshold of audibility and would therefore not, on its own, be distinguishable from background levels.
17 Nevertheless, the project would contribute a measureable increment to existing noise levels and may be
18 considered to contribute to cumulatively considerable noise impacts.

19 **Transportation/Circulation**

20 The transportation environmental setting for the cumulative transportation and circulation analysis includes
21 those streets and intersections that would be used by both automobile and truck traffic to gain access to and
22 from the proposed project and past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the SVLRC
23 vicinity, as well as those streets that would be used by construction traffic (i.e., equipment and commuting
24 workers).

25 Future peak hour and annual average daily freeway volumes along SR-118 from the City of Simi Valley
26 Travel Demand Forecasting Model were used for the Future freeway segment analysis. All the study freeway
27 segments are projected to continue to operate at the same LOS during the Future With Project scenario.
28 Therefore, the contribution of the project to cumulative freeway segment impacts is less than cumulatively
29 considerable.

30 Future peak hour volumes from the City of Simi Valley Travel Demand Forecasting Model were used for the
31 Future local roadway segment analysis. All the study roadway segments are projected to continue to operate
32 at the same unacceptable LOS during the Future With Project scenario. However, the project would not
33 contribute to a lowering of the level of service nor would it be responsible for more than 50 percent of the
34 increase in traffic volumes. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the project with regard to local roadway
35 segments is less than cumulatively considerable.

36 With regard to the intersection of Somis Road and SR-118, the proposed project is not expected to add
37 substantial traffic to the intersection. Given the proposed improvements in the reasonably foreseeable future,
38 the contribution of the project to the cumulative impacts is less than cumulatively considerable.

39 **Water Supply**

40 Past development has increased the amount of infrastructure, structural improvements, and number of people
41 working in the Simi Valley area (i.e., the cumulative geographic scope). Most of the water associated with
42 this past development has been supplied by the CMWD. Thus, these developments have had the effect of
43 increasing the water demand from this water purveyor. Similarly, present and reasonably foreseeable future

1 projects, including the existing SVLRC, would require water supply from the CMWD. In addition, in the
2 eastern portion of Simi Valley, there is a regional shortage of water pressure, which potentially affects fire-
3 fighting capabilities. Specifically, the lack of sufficient water pressure occurs in the Knolls area, a result of
4 insufficient water storage in the Alta Vista Zone storage tank.

5 The project would be served by the CMWD, which provides water that is in compliance with the applicable
6 State Drinking Water Standards. Therefore, impacts to water quality would be less than significant. CMWD
7 is considered by Ventura County to be a permanent source of water. A water availability letter from Ventura
8 County Waterworks District No. 8 would be submitted by CMWD with the proposed project application,
9 verifying that adequate water supplies are available. In addition, an updated water supply plan would be
10 included as part of a Master Development Plan, which is designed to ensure that the landfill is operated in an
11 environmentally safe manner and to mitigate any significant avoidable environmental impacts identified in the
12 EIR. The water supply plan would describe improvements to be made to assure adequate potable and non-
13 potable water for landfill operations, dust control, fire protection, landscaping, human consumption, and
14 hygiene. In addition, water supply at SVLRC is not derived from the Alta Vista water storage tank. Thus,
15 sufficient water pressure is available for fire-fighting purposes at SVLRC. Therefore, impacts would be less
16 than significant. All cumulative projects would be required to comply with the same protocol described
17 above for the proposed project, in order to determine availability of water supply from CMWD as well as
18 meet applicable water quality regulations. Therefore, the cumulative impact is less than significant and the
19 contribution of the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

20 **Waste Treatment/Disposal**

21 Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development that have an individual sewage disposal system,
22 or involve new or expanded solid waste facilities may have contributed cumulative impacts. There are no
23 past, present, or reasonably foreseeable solid waste facility projects that would contribute to cumulative
24 impacts. With respect to cumulative projects with an individual sewage disposal system, discretionary review
25 of these incremental projects minimizes cumulative impacts due to individual sewage disposal systems, as
26 projects are required to comply with state and local policies regarding individual sewage disposal systems.
27 Thus, impacts on sewage and treatment disposal associated with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable
28 buildout of the cumulative projects would not be cumulatively considerable. The project would be required to
29 obtain an individual WDR permit for the proposed on-site wastewater treatment plant from the LARWQCB.
30 The level of treatment required and permitted reuse would be specified in the WDR. As such, the proposed
31 project would conform with the requirements of the LARWQCB's Basin Plan concerning development
32 utilizing septic systems (LARWQCB 1994). In addition, the proposed on-site wastewater treatment facility
33 must meet operation and maintenance guidelines required by the Ventura County Environmental Health
34 Division; and meet requirements outlined in the Ventura County Building Code. Issuance of these permits
35 and compliance with applicable State and County regulations with respect to design and operation of the
36 treatment plant would reduce potential impacts from on-site sewage disposal to a level considered less than
37 cumulatively considerable. Cumulative projects that include individual sewage disposal systems would be
38 required to comply with the same regulations. Therefore, the cumulative impact is less than significant and
39 the contribution of the proposed project is less than cumulatively considerable.

40 **Recreational Facilities**

41 Cumulative impacts on recreational resources may result from the combined incremental demands on existing
42 local and regional parks/facilities and trails resulting from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable
43 development within the cumulative region of influence. Past development in the project vicinity and
44 surrounding areas has resulted in a deficit of developed parkland within the region. The majority of present
45 and reasonably foreseeable projects are residential developments that would result in a substantial demand for
46 recreational facilities in the region. Additionally, the Colton Lee Manufactured Housing Community (#8) has
47 the potential to impede future development of the RSRPD Trail #15 (Las Lajas to Black Canyon). Because

1 Quimby fees (provisions for the dedication of fees and/or parkland) are currently required for proposed
2 subdivision developments, the contributions of present and reasonably foreseeable projects to cumulative
3 recreation impacts in the area would not be cumulatively considerable.

4 No local or regional parks/facilities, regional trails/corridors are located within the proposed CUP boundary
5 such that no existing facilities would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The proposed project
6 would, however, result in a net increase of 150 employees, thereby creating the potential for an increase in
7 population and a corresponding increase in the demand for local and regional parks/facilities and
8 trails/corridors. Mitigation Measures REC-1 through REC-3 would offset costs of developing and/or
9 improving local and regional park/facilities and trails/corridors associated with increased demands on existing
10 recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative
11 contribution to cumulative impacts on local and regional parks/facilities.

12 One planned multi-purpose trail (Alamos Canyon Trail) and a 20-acre community park site is located within
13 the proposed CUP boundary. Thus, the proposed development would impede future development of
14 recreation parks/facilities and regional trails and impacts to these future facilities would be significant.
15 However, implementation of Mitigation Measures REC-1 through REC-3 would ensure that impacts would be
16 less than significant. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative
17 contribution to cumulative impacts on the future development of recreational facilities.

18 **ES.6 Public Involvement**

19 The County issued a Notice of Preparation and Initial Study (NOP/IS) for SVLRC CUP-3142-8 on December
20 20, 2007. The NOP/IS described the project and the environmental review process and solicited public input
21 on environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR. Copies of the NOP/IS were distributed to various
22 movement agencies, organizations and individuals during the 30-day review period. The NOP and IS was also
23 made available for review at various libraries and online at the County Planning Department website. During
24 the public review period, 21 comment letters were received.

25 The County conducted a public scoping meeting on June 2, 2008 at the City of Simi Valley Council Chamber.
26 During this meeting the County presented information on the project and solicited public input on topics to be
27 addressed in the EIR. During the Scoping meeting 11 individuals provided comments. Table 1.6-1
28 summarizes the environmental issues that were identified during the NOP/IS public review period and the
29 public scoping process and indicates the EIR sections in which these issues were addressed.

30 **ES.7 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

31 Table ES.7-1 summarizes the environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified in this EIR.

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Land Use/General Plan Goals, Policies, and Programs			
Impact LU-1: Community Character. Compatibility of design/architectural style with the surrounding community. Including surrounding land uses, buildings, General Plan designations, zoning, and parcel sizes.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact LU-2: Existing Housing. Forced removal of housing that are currently or were formerly renter-occupied, that are affordable to families of either moderate-income located within the coastal zone and/or lower-income located within the County, resulting in adverse impact on existing housing.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact LU-3: Demand for Housing. Increase the demand for housing due to construction or operation.	Significant	LU-1: The applicant shall pay a one-time fee (as determined by the decision-making body) to a County-approved low-income-housing entity or an established housing trust fund to assist in providing for construction of affordable housing within the vicinity of Simi Valley.	Less than significant
Impact LU-4: Growth Inducement. Significance of growth inducing impacts of a project depends on how much added growth would be accommodated by removing the impediment and setting a precedent for similar actions in the future and whether that growth is consistent with the planned land use of an areas, and the physical impacts of said growth.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Air Quality			
Impact AQ-1c: VCAPCD Daily Emission significance Criteria. Project construction would produce emissions that exceed VCAPCD daily ROC and NO _x emission significance thresholds.	Significant	AQ-1: The construction contractor shall implement following measures to mitigate ozone precursor emissions from on-site off-road construction equipment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All construction equipment shall meet the EPA Tier 3 nonroad equivalent standards. The construction contractor shall be exempt from this requirement if he provides proof that a given piece of equipment is unavailable within the California that meets Tier 3 standards. 2. Minimize equipment idling time. 3. Maintain equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers' specifications. 4. Lengthen the construction period during smog season (May through October), to minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating at the same time. 	Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (continued)			
Impact AQ-1c (continued)	Significant	Encourage the use of alternatively fueled construction equipment, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), or electricity, if feasible.	Less than significant
Impact AQ-2c: Project construction would result in offsite ambient air pollutant concentrations that would contribute to an exceedance of an ambient air quality standard.	Significant	See AQ-1.	Significant for (1) 1-hour CAAQS for NO ₂ , (2) 24-hour CAAQS for PM ₁₀ , (3) annual CAAQS for PM ₁₀ , and (4) 24-hour NAAQS for PM _{2.5} .
		<p>AQ-2: Additional Fugitive Dust Controls for Construction.</p> <p>The calculation of unmitigated fugitive dust emissions from proposed construction activities is based upon compliance with VCAPCD Rule 55, Fugitive Dust, which is assumed to produce a 50 percent reduction in PM₁₀ emissions from uncontrolled levels. This would occur with the use of rigorous watering of the site and other control measures, such as a limitation of vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour (mph) on-site.</p> <p>The proposed construction contractor shall develop and implement dust control methods to achieve a 90 percent reduction of fugitive dust emissions from uncontrolled levels. Additional control measures to reduce fugitive dust shall include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Designate personnel to monitor the dust control program and order increased watering, as necessary, to ensure a 90 percent control level. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. 2. Apply approved non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas or replace groundcover in disturbed areas. 3. Provide temporary wind fencing around sites being graded or worked. 4. Cover truck loads that haul dirt, sand, or gravel or maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with Section 23114 of the California Vehicle Code. 5. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off tires of vehicles and any equipment leaving the site. 6. Suspend all soil disturbance activities when winds exceed 25 mph as instantaneous gusts or when visible dust plumes emanate from the site and stabilize all disturbed areas. 7. Sweep all streets at least once a day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water). 8. Apply water three times daily, or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces. <p>Pave road and road shoulders.</p>	

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Air Quality (continued)			
AQ-3c: Project construction would expose the public to toxic air contaminants (TACs).	Less than significant	See AQ-1 .	Less than significant
AQ-4c: Project construction would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Less than significant	See AQ-1 and AQ-2 .	Less than significant
AQ-5c: Project construction would generate fugitive dust emissions in such quantities as to endanger the public.	Less than significant	See AQ-2 .	Less than significant
AQ-6c: Project construction would generate odorous emissions in such quantities as to endanger the public.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
AQ-7c. Potential incremental contributions from the project to global climate change.	Incrementally contribute to global climate change.	See AQ-1 .	Incrementally contribute to global climate change.
Impact AQ-1o: Project operations would produce emissions that exceed VCAPCD daily ROC and NOx emission significance thresholds.	Significant	<p>AQ-3: To reduce peak daily emissions of ROC and NOx from Project operations, the landfill operator shall implement the following measures to mitigate ozone precursor emissions from on-site off-road mobile equipment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beginning in 2009, convert equipment to engines with EPA nonroad Tier 3 standards, where feasible. 2. Minimize equipment idling time. 3. Maintain equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers' specifications. 4. Use alternatively fueled equipment, such as CNG, LNG, or electric, if feasible. 	Significant
Impact AQ-2o: Project construction and operation would result in offsite ambient air pollutant concentrations that would contribute to an exceedance of an ambient air quality standard.	Significant	<p>See AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3.</p> <p>AQ-4: The calculation of unmitigated fugitive dust emissions from proposed construction and operational activities is based upon compliance with VCAPCD Rule 55, Fugitive Dust, which is assumed to produce a 50 to 75 percent reduction in PM₁₀ emissions from uncontrolled levels, depending on the source type. This would occur with the use of rigorous watering of the site and other control measures, such as a limitation of vehicle speeds to 15 mph on-site.</p> <p>The project landfill operator shall develop and implement dust control methods to achieve a 90 percent reduction of fugitive dust emissions from uncontrolled levels. Additional control measures to reduce fugitive dust shall include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Designate personnel to monitor the dust control program and 	Significant for (1) 1-hour CAAQS for NO ₂ ; (2) 24-hour CAAQS for PM ₁₀ ; (3) annual CAAQS for PM ₁₀ ; (4) 24-hour NAAQS for PM _{2.5} ; and (5) annual CAAQS and NAAQS for PM _{2.5} .

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (continued)			
Impact AQ-2o (continued)	Significant	<p>order increased watering, as necessary, to ensure a 90 percent control level. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Apply approved non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction and operational areas or replace groundcover in disturbed areas. 3. Provide temporary wind fencing around sites being graded or worked. 4. Cover truck loads that haul dirt, sand, or gravel or maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with Section 23114 of the California Vehicle Code. 5. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off tires of vehicles and any equipment leaving the site. 6. Suspend all soil disturbance activities when winds exceed 25 mph as instantaneous gusts or when visible dust plumes emanate from the site and stabilize all disturbed areas. 7. Sweep all streets at least once a day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water). 8. Apply water three times daily, or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces. 9. Pave road and road shoulders. <p>AQ-5: Simi Valley Landfill Emissions Reduction Program Agreement. In instances, when air quality impacts from mobile sources due to project operations cannot be mitigated to insignificant levels with the available air pollution control measures recommended for the project, the VCAPCD, in its Air Quality Assessment Guidelines, recommends implementing an Emissions Reduction Program to ensure additional mitigation of air quality impacts by requiring the project proponent to contribute funds for programs that reduce air pollutant emissions from non-project sources. However, while several municipal jurisdictions in the county have enacted air emissions mitigation programs in the form of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs, Ventura County has not established a Government Code section 66000 et seq. fee rule or made a Board of Supervisors commitment to adopt such a fee rule to assess, collect, and spend such fees on mitigation programs.</p>	Significant for (1) 1-hour CAAQS for NO ₂ ; (2) 24-hour CAAQS for PM ₁₀ ; (3) annual CAAQS for PM ₁₀ ; (4) 24-hour NAAQS for PM _{2.5} ; and (5) annual CAAQS and NAAQS for PM _{2.5} .

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Air Quality (continued)			
Impact AQ-2o (continued)	Significant	<p>Therefore, to accomplish the purposes of an Emissions Reduction Program, some other legally enforceable, feasible mechanism to achieve the same result is required. In this instance, a legally enforceable agreement between the County of Ventura, VCAPCD, and the applicant (WMI) could be executed such that funding would be provided by the applicant via the agreement to the VCAPCD for the purpose of funding emission reduction programs in Ventura County, based on estimated mobile source emissions from operations in excess of standards. Such an agreement would, at a minimum, have the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A binding agreement would be executed by the County of Ventura, the VCAPCD, and the applicant wherein the applicant commits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To the payment of fees, calculated based on the amount of project operational emissions from mobile sources in excess of standards, into a fund administered by the VCAPCD. Fees would be determined based on the project’s mobile source emissions in excess of standards and the cost-effectiveness of projects funded by the VCAPCD’s Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program. ○ Pay the assessed fees over a time period mutually agreeable to all parties. • The VCAPCD would be entitled to recover all cost of administrating the expenditure of the funds so collected. • The fees would be used by the VCAPCD to fund emission reduction projects in Ventura County. Projects that could be funded include, but would not necessarily be limited to, project types eligible for funding under the VCAPCD’s emission reduction incentive programs such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program,</i> 	Significant for (1) 1-hour CAAQS for NO ₂ ; (2) 24-hour CAAQS for PM ₁₀ ; (3) annual CAAQS for PM ₁₀ ; (4) 24-hour NAAQS for PM _{2.5} ; and (5) annual CAAQS and NAAQS for PM _{2.5} .

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Air Quality (continued)			
Impact AQ-2o (continued)	Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Clean Air Fund,</i> ○ <i>The Lower Emissions School Bus Program, and</i> ○ <i>The Lawn Mower Trade-In Program.</i> <p>Emission reduction programs such as the one described above facilitate reductions in emissions by reducing individual vehicle emissions (buses, trucks, etc.) and emissions from other devices and equipment powered by internal combustion engines through the use of more efficient engines, less polluting fuels, or electric or hybrid power sources. It is uncertain the extent to which the Simi Valley Landfill and Recycling Center Emissions Reduction Program would offset overall project-related vehicular emissions and it is not possible to calculate what those reductions might be because the specific emission mitigation projects are unknown at this time. However, implementing an Emissions Reduction Program Agreement for the proposed Simi Valley Landfill expansion project is considered an effective emission reduction measure.</p>	Significant for (1) 1-hour CAAQS for NO ₂ ; (2) 24-hour CAAQS for PM ₁₀ ; (3) annual CAAQS for PM ₁₀ ; (4) 24-hour NAAQS for PM _{2.5} ; and (5) annual CAAQS and NAAQS for PM _{2.5} .
AQ-3o: Project construction and operation would expose the public to TACs.	Less than significant	See AQ-1 and AQ-3 .	Less than significant
AQ-4o: Project operation would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Less than significant	See AQ-3 and AQ-4 .	Less than significant
AQ-5o: Project operations would generate fugitive dust emissions in such quantities as to endanger the public.	Less than significant	See AQ-4 .	Less than significant
AQ-6o: Project operation would generate odorous emissions in such quantities as to endanger the public.	Less than Significant	AQ-6: Odor Control Plan. The landfill operator shall implement Condition Number 41, Odor Control Plan, in Conditional Use Permit CUP-3142-7 during proposed operations at the SVLRC. This plan shall be updated, as deemed necessary to comply with current regulations, by the Ventura County Environmental Health Division (EHD) and Planning Division.	Less than Significant
Impact AQ-7o: Potential incremental contributions from the project to global climate change.	Incrementally contribute to global climate change.	See AQ-3 .	Incrementally contribute to global climate change.

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Water Resources			
Impact WR-1: Groundwater Quantity. Directly or indirectly decrease the net quantity of groundwater in a basin that is overdrafted; cause non overdrafted basin(s) to become overdrafted; result in a net increase in groundwater extraction In areas where the basin condition is not known.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact WR-2: Groundwater Quality. Degrade the quality of groundwater and cause groundwater to fail to meet groundwater quality objectives set by the LARWQCB.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact WR-3: Surface Water Quantity. Increase the net utilization of surface water in a hydraulic unit that is overdrafted; adversely impacts an overdrafted hydrologic unit; cause the hydraulic unit to become overdrafted; or result in a net increase in surface water for hydraulic units in which the condition is not known.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact WR-4: Surface Water Quality. Degrades the quality of surface water and causes it to fail to meet surface water quality objectives for a hydrologic unit defined in the most recent Water Quality Control Plan.	Significant	WR-1: Toe Barrier Liquid Analysis by VCWPD. Toe barrier liquids sampling results shall be reviewed by the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Water & Environmental Resources Division, Water Quality Section, for conformance with Basin Plan surface water quality objectives, including associated TMDLs, prior to use in dust control. In the event that sampling results are in excess of these water quality objectives, use of toe barrier liquids for dust control shall cease pending enhanced remedial actions and additional sampling demonstrating that the toe barrier liquids are within acceptable limits.	Less than significant
		WR-2: Stormwater Runoff Analysis by VCWPD. Stormwater runoff sampling results shall be reviewed by the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Water & Environmental Resources Division, Water Quality Section, for conformance with Basin Plan surface water quality objectives, including associated TMDLs. In the event that sampling results are in excess of these water quality objectives, on-site Best Management Practices shall be adjusted and enhanced until additional sampling demonstrates that stormwater runoff is within acceptable limits.	

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Water Resources (continued)			
<p>Impact WR-5: Flooding. Flooding hazards are ubiquitous throughout Ventura County and are accommodated by the Ventura County Building Code and the Ventura County Watershed Protection District Standards and Specifications Design Manual. The effects of flooding hazards are required to be considered within the existing framework of grading and building code ordinances which apply to all projects.</p>	Significant	<p>WR-3: Detention/Sedimentation Basin Armoring. The proposed detention/sedimentation basin in the northwest portion of Phase III, at the confluence of Alamos Canyon Creek and the tributary creek to the northeast, shall be armored sufficiently to withstand erosive flow associated with a 100-year storm event along Alamos Canyon Creek. Basin armoring shall include rock rip-rap, precast concrete block, or roller compacted concrete.</p>	Less than significant
		<p>WR-4: Downstream Erosion Control Measures. The applicant shall coordinate with the VCWPD, Advanced Planning Section, Floodplain Management Division, in developing erosion control features within Alamos Canyon Creek, downstream of the proposed detention/sedimentation basin in the northwest portion of Phase III, at the confluence of Alamos Canyon Creek and the tributary creek to the northeast, to address increased stormwater runoff flow velocities adjacent to the proposed basin. Alternatively, the detention/sedimentation basin shall be redesigned such that it does not encroach on the designated floodplain.</p>	
Biological Resources			
<p>Impact BIO-1: Endangered, Threatened, or Rare Species and Nesting Birds. Directly or indirectly: reduce species population; reduce species habitat; or restrict reproductive capacity.</p>	Significant	<p>BIO-1: Pre-construction botanical surveys shall be conducted by a County-approved biologist for the Braunton’s milk vetch, San Fernando Valley spineflower, Lyon’s pentachaeta, and other listed species during the appropriate flowering period prior to start of grading activities (including, but not limited to: initial construction activities, development of each landfill cell, and other project-related activities) within suitable habitat for these species. The applicant shall notify United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) within 24 hours of locating any individuals of these species. In the event of positive survey results, the project applicant would consult with the USFWS to determine whether formal Section 7 consultation should be initiated.</p>	Less than significant
		<p>BIO-2: Prior to removal of coastal scrub habitat from construction activities (including initial construction activities, development of each landfill cell, and any other project-related activities), a qualified biologist shall conduct protocol surveys for coastal California gnatcatcher and the results provided to the County of Ventura, USFWS, and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Appropriate coordination with and approval of agencies would be required. The applicant shall notify USFWS at least 7 days prior to initiation of surveys and within 24 hours of locating any gnatcatchers.</p>	

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Biological Resources (continued)			
Impact BIO-1 (continued)	Significant	<p>In the event of positive survey results, the project applicant would consult with the USFWS to determine whether formal Section 7 consultation should be initiated. In addition, should this species be found on-site a qualified biologist shall do the following:</p> <p>a. Perform additional surveys once a week during project construction during the breeding season of the coastal California gnatcatcher. These additional surveys may be suspended as approved by the USFWS. The applicant shall notify the USFWS at least 7 days prior to the initiation of surveys, and within 24 hours of locating any coastal California gnatcatchers.</p> <p>Postpone work if a gnatcatcher nest is found within 500 feet of project construction activities. A qualified biologist shall coordinate with USFWS to devise an optimal strategy of postponing work only in areas where continued construction activities may pose an adverse impact to the coastal California gnatcatcher, thereby allowing work to continue beyond the 500 foot buffer beyond documented gnatcatcher nests.</p> <p>BIO-3: Removal of vegetation from construction activities (including initial construction activities, development of each landfill cell, and any other project-related activities) shall be conducted outside the breeding season (February 1 through August 15) in order to avoid destruction of bird nests or eggs.</p> <p>If vegetation removal cannot be completed outside the February 1 through August 15 breeding season, vegetation removal in areas where suitable nesting habitat for resident or migratory bird species may occur shall occur only after pre-grading surveys by a County-approved biologist show that active nests would not be impacted by the activities. The pre-grading surveys shall focus on breeding behavior and nesting locations in the proposed work area and immediately adjacent to that area. Based on the results of the surveys, recommended buffer areas between construction activities and observed nesting habitat shall be provided to the County and to the project engineer if the work needs to occur near those locations while nesting is occurring (February 1 through August 15).</p>	Less than significant
Impact BIO-2: Wetland Habitat. Direct reduction of, or a substantial indirect impact to, a significant Wetland Habitat. All wetlands are potentially significant.	Significant	BIO-4: The project applicant shall prepare and implement a wetlands mitigation plan acceptable to the County of Ventura prior to initiation of grading activity in the vicinity of the known seeps. Appropriate mitigation would include enhancing, expanding, or restoring existing wetlands, creating/establishment of new wetlands, or permanently protecting wetlands in the proposed project vicinity. The wetlands	Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Biological Resources (continued)			
Impact BIO-2 (continued)		mitigation plan shall include the following components at a minimum: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A minimum mitigation ratio of 3:1 for acres of wetlands lost versus acres mitigated as a result of the Plan. 2. Location(s) of mitigation on suitable portions of the project site or other property that can be protected in perpetuity from future development. 3. Timing which shall be initiated prior to acceptance of waste within proposed expansion area. 4. Detailed information on the vegetation, quality, soils, and hydrology of the mitigation site prior to implementation 5. The mitigation shall have a goal of no net loss of wetlands. Additional goals may include specific functions and values of habitat types to be established, restored, enhanced, and/or preserved. 6. Methods for restoration, creation, or enhancement (as applicable). 7. Baseline information (i.e., a description of the ecological characteristics of the proposed mitigation project site), if applicable, shall be obtained as a basis for measuring mitigation performance. Baseline information may include: descriptions of historic and existing plant communities, historic and existing hydrology, soil conditions, a map showing the locations of the impact and mitigation site(s) or the geographic coordinates for those site(s), and other characteristics appropriate to the type of resource proposed as compensation. 8. Monitoring, maintenance, and reporting for a minimum monitoring period, which shall not be less than 5 years, if applicable. 9. Performance criteria, if applicable, must be approved by the County and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Performance criteria shall at a minimum include the following parameters: percent cover, plant diversity, percent non-native plant species, target functions and values, and target hydrological regime. 10. The plan shall include an adaptive management strategy to address unforeseen changes in site conditions or other components of the mitigation project, including the party or parties responsible for implementing adaptive management measures. 11. Procedures to ensure protection of the mitigation sites in perpetuity, either through the recordation of a conservation easement, a deed restriction, recordation of a development's covenants, codes, and restrictions, or other agreements approved by the County and other relevant regulatory agencies. 	Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Biological Resources (continued)			
<p>Impact BIO-3: Migration Corridors. Substantially interfere with the use of said area by fish or wildlife. This could occur through elimination of native vegetation, erection of physical barriers, or intimidation of fish or wildlife via introduction of noise, light, development, or increased human presence.</p>	<p>Significant</p>	<p>BIO-5: The permittee shall implement vector control methods to deter refuse scavenging species such as gulls and crows from the waste disposal area. In the vicinity of Alamos Canyon, vector control methods (such as noisemakers and propane cannons, distress call, and use of falcons and dogs) that could result in the avoidance of the use of Alamos Canyon as a wildlife corridor, shall be avoided.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
		<p>BIO-6: To ensure the continued availability of the Alamos Canyon Wildlife Corridor for the benefit of native plants and wildlife, the permittee shall obtain, dedicate, enhance, and manage habitat in and adjacent to the Alamos Canyon wildlife corridor (including the riparian zone and adjacent upland habitats) from the SR-118 freeway place extending northward at least to the latitude of the northernmost portion of buffer area associated with the proposed landfill expansion. Dedication shall be in perpetuity through a legal instrument such as a conservation easement. Enhancement shall be as described in Mitigation Measure BIO-7.</p>	
		<p>BIO-7: The permittee shall design and implement a plan acceptable to the County of Ventura for habitat enhancements along the channel in Alamos Canyon in order to improve overstory cover for migrating animals and to increase potential habitat for species that rely on riparian corridors. The plan must provide for planting and maintenance of sycamore and coast live oak trees to be planted and maintained in and adjacent to Alamos Canyon in areas void of trees. By focusing especially on areas of the canyon near the landfill and areas having direct line of sight to the landfill, the plan will create a pattern of more continuous tree cover. A minimum of 30 sycamores and 30 coast live oaks shall be established within the area identified above (see also Figure 3.4-3). Specifications for these habitat enhancements shall be included in the Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan identified in Mitigation Measure BIO-13. In addition, planting of vegetation or other work within or adjacent to Los Alamos Canyon channel falls under the regulatory and permitting authority of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District per Ordinance FC-18 as amended. As such, habitat enhancement plans for Alamos Canyon shall be reviewed and commented on by the Watershed Protection District.</p>	

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (continued)			
Impact BIO-3 (continued)	Significant	<p>BIO-8: The permittee shall construct improvements or enhancements to the Alamos Canyon crossings (i.e., Alamos Canyon East and West culverts and Alamos Canyon Road undercrossing) as shown on Figure 3.4-3) in order to enhance the ability of wildlife in the project vicinity, including Alamos and Brea canyons, to move under SR-118 thereby helping to maintain wildlife diversity in Ventura County. Mitigation proposed below was originally described by LSA Associates (2004) and adopted by the Ventura SR-118 Wildlife Corridor Multi-Agency Working Group (2006). These measures were supported and supplemented by Penrod et al. (2006). The permittee shall work with the County of Ventura, Caltrans, and technical advisors selected by the County to identify and implement the most effective and feasible measures to increase connectivity across SR-118 along Alamos Canyon, with final approval of measures from the County prior to commencing project construction. These may be a combination of measures from the following list of previously identified measures from studies referenced above. Because it is not known which of these measures would be technically feasible, the standard for success of this measure will be implementation and maintenance of three or more of the actions identified below, which have been previously identified by experts as actions that would facilitate wildlife crossing under SR-118, plus the two measures identified below that are applicable to all three crossings. Planting of vegetation or other work within or adjacent to Los Alamos Canyon channel falls under the regulatory and permitting authority of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District per Ordinance FC-18 as amended. As such, habitat enhancement plans for Alamos Canyon shall be reviewed and commented on by the Watershed Protection District</p> <p><i>Alamos Canyon West Corridor:</i> The following enhancements would decrease the angle of approach, thereby improving access and line-of-sight for wildlife.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance and maintain riparian vegetation near culverts. • Enlarge the existing twin culverts into a single undercrossing under SR-118 by re-grading the existing steep approach and lowering the entrance on the north side of the culvert; or, by creating a raised 5-foot wide inside “catwalk” running the length of both culverts. 	Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Biological Resources (continued)			
Impact BIO-3 (continued)	Significant	<p><i>Alamos Canyon Road Undercrossing:</i> The following changes would enhance the utility of the undercrossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the vegetative cover along Alamos Canyon Road. • Replace the paved road with a decomposed granite surface if it is still used for maintenance, otherwise remove the road surface and base entirely and replace it with native vegetation. • Remove the barbed wire fencing along the road. <p>Enlarge undercrossings at the railroad crossing south of SR-118 and at Los Angeles Avenue.</p> <p><i>Alamos Canyon East Corridor:</i> The following enhancements would increase the utility of the undercrossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase vegetation cover along the drainage. • Enlarge the culvert by means of “tunnel jacking”. <p><i>Measures Applicable to the three Alamos Canyon Corridors:</i> The following measures apply to the three Alamos Canyon corridors/undercrossings identified above and in Figure 3.4-3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of fencing by the project applicant to funnel wildlife into the Alamos Canyon undercrossings, • Reporting to the proper authorities (including police or Caltrans) any unauthorized human activities or trespassing (including homeless encampments) in the vicinity of Alamos Canyon observed during routine patrols would increase the utility of the undercrossings. <p>Additionally, collaboration should be done with local groups to secure conservation easements on properties between the SLVRC and the Simi Hills to provide a continuous habitat corridor between the Santa Susana Mountains, Oak Ridge, Big Mountain, and the Simi Hills.</p> <p>BIO-9: The conditions applicable to minimizing off-site noise and vibration, nighttime lighting, control of wind-blown refuse, and control of nuisance species of birds (crows, ravens, gulls) and mammals (non-native rodents) in CUP-3142-7 shall be applied to the expansion project including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Night lighting for the proposed project shall in accordance with CUP-3142-7 Condition 34 limiting hours of operation to 6 AM to 8 PM and CUP-3142-7 Condition 105 requiring shielding to ensure 	Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (continued)			
Impact BIO-3 (continued)	Significant	<p>that when night lighting is used, natural areas are not lighted. These measures shall be updated as necessary and applied to the proposed project.</p> <p>A revised dust suppression plan shall be implemented as required under CUP-3142-7 Condition 44.</p> <p>Litter shall be controlled through the use of portable wind fences to confine waste to the area of the working face and to ensure that adjacent habitats are maintained free of litter. Existing litter control measures (CUP-3142-7 Condition 45) shall be applied to the proposed project.</p>	Less than significant
<p>Impact BIO-4: Locally Important Plant and Wildlife Species/Communities. Directly or indirectly cause a substantial reduction in population numbers, habitat area, or reproductive capacity. For locally important communities or habitats a significant impact would result if the Project caused a substantial reduction in area or impairment in quality or function.</p>	Significant	<p>See BIO-3.</p> <p>BIO-10: The project proponent shall develop and implement a Sensitive Plant Species Restoration Plan for Plummer's and Catalina mariposa lily acceptable to Ventura County Planning Division prior to onset of grading in the expansion area. The plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An up to date review of research on the reproductive success of each species and the success of previous attempts at salvage and transplanting; • Methodology and timing for salvaging seed and plants (corms) from areas to be impacted and procedures for transplanting and/or propagation; • Identification of suitable (approved) locations for transplants and the means to protect the locations from future development; • Maintenance, monitoring, and replacement program to document the success of the transplantation and restoration of Plummer's mariposa lily and Catalina mariposa lily; and, • The number of individuals lost as a result of the proposed project shall be restored in-kind on-site with a 1:1 ratio. <p>BIO-11: Pre-construction spring botanical surveys shall be conducted by a County-approved biologist for the Plummer's mariposa lily, Catalina mariposa lily, and other locally important plant species with the potential to occur within the project site prior to start of grading activities including, but not limited to: initial construction.</p>	Less than significant Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Biological Resources (continued)			
Impact BIO-4 (continued)	Significant	<p>BIO-12: A preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a County-approved biologist for locally important wildlife species no sooner than 14 days prior to the start of grading including, but not limited to: initial construction activities, development of each landfill cell, and any other project-related activities in vegetated areas. Prior to vegetation removal, the biologist shall ensure that potential natal badger dens are avoided and that less mobile species, such as coast horned lizard, will be relocated to suitable habitat outside of the construction area. A qualified biologist shall be on-site to monitor vegetation removal and topsoil salvaging and stockpiling to minimize injury or mortality to locally important wildlife species.</p> <p>BIO-13: The applicant shall develop a Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan to address losses of habitats of locally important species through revegetation efforts that emphasize native plant species and provision of quality habitat for locally important wildlife species and other native wildlife. This shall be applied to all lands temporarily disturbed by grading as well as intermediate, permanent slopes and closed portions of the landfill as indicated below. The plan shall be subject to review and approval by Ventura County prior to its implementation and be completed and implemented prior to the initiation of ground disturbance. The plan shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions for salvaging and stockpiling topsoil and seed bank for use in revegetation. • Procedures to stabilize soil and revegetate areas disturbed by site preparation or other grading outside the overall waste boundary with native species from seed or cuttings collected in the immediate project area creating habitat conditions compatible with adjoining habitat not disturbed by the project. • Specifications that native plants and seed stock used in revegetation shall be locally collected or propagated from locally collected seed or cuttings (from the Simi Valley area) to maintain the genetic integrity of the local flora. An attempt shall be made to restore some of the existing native plant diversity by specifically including some of the less common native species currently found on the site. • Specifics for seed mix, seed application, seeding methods, timing of monitoring and reporting and performance criteria. • Provision that non-native, non-invasive species may be used for short-term erosion control (such as barley on temporarily denuded slopes) or for long-term visual mitigation. Where invasive species have persisted after having been used in the past, they shall be removed. 	Less than significant Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (continued)			
Impact BIO-4 (continued)	Significant	<p>Procedures for maintenance and reduction of non-native invasive plant species on the proposed SVLRC landfill site and adjacent property owned by the applicant. The invasive non-native plants/escaped non-natives listed in the following sources shall be targeted as undesirable plants:</p> <p>BIO-14: The loss of habitat for locally important wildlife species on-site, including sage scrub, chamise chaparral, grassland, and oak woodland, shall be mitigated by off-site restoration and preservation of an equal or greater acreage of these plant communities in the project vicinity. This measure would ideally be coordinated with the Mitigation Measure BIO-6. Restoration measures would depend on the specifics of the parcel to be preserved but could include control of invasive non-native species, increasing the prevalence of high-value wildlife species by planting or use of other management techniques, revegetation of barren surfaces resulting from previous human activities or control of erosion related to human activities (e.g., originating from concentrated runoff from unpaved roads). Preserved and restored habitat shall be of similar or higher quality and integrity in comparison to the habitat removed and shall be dedicated and managed as vegetation and wildlife habitat in perpetuity through a legal instrument such as a conservation easement. A site-specific habitat restoration and enhancement plan including details of restoration measures appropriate to the site and performance criteria shall be developed by the applicant and approved by the County of Ventura prior to initiation of ground disturbance.</p>	Less than significant Less than significant
Agricultural Resources			
Impact AG-1: Soils. Direct and/or indirect loss of soils designated Prime, Statewide Importance, Unique or Local Importance or agricultural soils meeting or exceeding the acres lost criteria.	Significant	None feasible.	Significant
Impact AG-2: Dust. Result in a ten percent or greater increase in dust on agricultural parcels within one-half mile of the proposed project.	Significant	AG-1: Fugitive Dust. Project construction and operations would comply with VCAPCD Rule 55, Fugitive Dust, which would reduce project PM ₁₀ emissions from uncontrolled levels by 50 to 75 percent, depending on the source type. Mitigation measures AQ-2, Additional Fugitive Dust Controls for Construction and AQ-4, Additional Fugitive Dust Controls for Operations (presented in Section 3.2.2.4 of this EIR), would further reduce fugitive dust emissions from these sources to 90 percent from uncontrolled levels.	Significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Visual Resources/Glare			
Impact VIS-1: Scenic Highways. Change or obstruct important visual resources as experienced from a scenic highway during construction or operation.	Significant	None feasible.	Significant
Impact VIS-2: Scenic Areas/Features. Degrade scenic areas or features or significantly alter them during construction or operation.	Significant	VIS-1: All landscaping plans shall follow the <i>Ventura County Guide to Landscape Plans</i> guidelines. This shall occur prior to the issuance of the Conditional Use Permit modification. The Plans specify the minimum landscape and irrigation coverage, minimum plant survival rates, and suggested drought tolerant species.	Significant
Impact VIS-3: Glare. Create substantial sources of light or glare.	Significant	<p>VIS-2: Prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for the construction of any facilities that include outdoor lighting, the permittee shall develop a Lighting Plan that meets the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There shall be no light source in excess of 150 watts that directly illuminates adjacent properties; • Outdoor lighting shall not result in the indirect illumination of adjacent properties in excess of 0.5 foot candles; • For pedestrian lighting systems, there shall be no point of overlap between light patterns greater than seven feet; and • There shall be no lighting within the Project site that is greater than seven foot-candles. <p>The locations of all exterior lighting fixtures, an arrow showing the direction of light being cast by each fixture, and the height of the fixtures shall be depicted on the Lighting Plan to be reviewed by the Resource Management Agency, Planning Division, prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance. All lighting shall be shielded, shall be directed downwards, and shall avoid being directed towards facilities with reflective surfaces that could produce glare off-site. The Lighting Plan shall be consistent with any mitigation measures that are developed to avoid or reduce impacts to wildlife movement, and shall not result in the illumination of sensitive habitat.</p> <p>VIS-3: Prior to the issuance of a Use Inauguration Zoning Clearance for grading activities within the proposed landfill expansion area, the permittee shall submit a lighting plan to the Resource Management Agency, Planning Division for temporary lighting that will be used to facilitate start-up/shutdown operations. The lighting plan shall comply with the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There shall be no light source in excess of 150 watts that directly illuminates adjacent properties; • Outdoor lighting shall not result in the indirect illumination of adjacent properties in excess of 0.5 foot candles; and • There shall be no lighting within the Project site that is greater than seven foot-candles. <p>All lighting shall be shielded, shall be directed downwards, and shall avoid being directed towards equipment with reflective</p>	Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Visual Resources/Glare (continued)			
Impact VIS-3 (continued)	Significant	services that could produce glare off-site. The lighting plan shall specify the number, type, intensity, and duration of use of all lighting that will be used for start-up/shutdown operations.	Less than significant
Geology and Seismic Hazards, Mineral Resources, and Paleontological Resources			
Impact GEO-1: Fault Rupture Hazards. Project exists along pre-existing faults or within a State of California designated Alquist-Priolo Special Fault Study Zone; a County of Ventura designated Fault Hazard area; or a County of Ventura designated Potential Fault Hazard Area.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact GEO-2: Ground Shaking Hazards. Ground shaking hazards are ubiquitous throughout Ventura County and, ground failure phenomena aside, are accommodated by the Ventura County Building Code. The effects of ground shaking hazard are required to be considered within the existing framework of grading and building code ordinances which apply to all sites and projects. Special threshold criteria for ground shaking hazard are thus not established.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact GEO-3: Liquefaction Hazards. A liquefaction hazard is considered to exist based on project location with respect to mapped liquefaction-susceptible areas on the County General Plan maps, on maps contained in Division of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 76-5LA; and whether the project is located in a shallow bedrock area versus and area underlain by recent or older alluvium.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact GEO-4: Subsidence. A subsistence hazard is considered to exist on all new water and oil well projects in Ventura County and for all utility and drainage facility projects in the Oxnard Plain.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact GEO-5: Expansive Soils. An expansive soil hazard is considered to exist where soil with an expansion index of greater than 20 are present.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Geology and Seismic Hazards, Mineral Resources, and Paleontological Resources (continued)			
Impact GEO-6: Landslides/Mudslides. Location of the site or project in areas with slopes greater than ten percent.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact GEO-7: Petroleum Resources. Land use that is proposed to be located in or immediately adjacent to any known petroleum resource area, or adjacent to a principal access road to an existing petroleum Conditional Use Permit (CUP).	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact GEO-8: Paleontological Resources. Direct impacts to fossil sites including grading and excavation of fossiliferous rock, which can result in the loss of scientifically important fossil specimens and associated geological data. Indirect impact including increased access opportunities and unauthorized collection of fossil materials.	Significant	GEO-1: Paleontological Mitigation Program. An updated/expanded Paleontological Mitigation Program shall be submitted by Waste Management, Inc. to the County Planning Division for review and approval.	Significant
Cultural Resources			
Impact CUL-1: Cultural Resources. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological or historical resource.	Significant	CUL-1: Construction and operation of the proposed project shall avoid Wharton Ranch. If avoidance is not possible, Phase II testing and evaluation of potential archaeological deposits within the Wharton Ranch areas shall be conducted prior to any surface disturbance in the vicinity of the ranch. Provisions must also be made for consultation with the County for approval of reporting of the findings of the Phase II testing, and, if need be, follow-on Phase III data recovery. Provision must also be made for curation of artifacts collected.	Less than significant
		CUL-2: Due to the poor visibility over much of the survey area and the lack of final construction plans such as depth of excavation and extent of maintenance activities, a full time archeological monitor shall be on-site during all brush clearance and disturbance of the first one foot of soil in areas that have not previously been disturbed. In the event that potentially significant archaeological materials are encountered during project-related ground disturbance, all work must be halted within the vicinity of the discovery until an assessment of the significance by a qualified archaeologist is completed. If significant resources are determined to be present, sufficient time must be allotted for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigations measures such as Phase II testing and/or Phase III Data Recovery of significant archaeological deposits. Treatment plans must be developed in consultation with the County and local Native Americans. Provisions must also be made for reporting of the findings of any testing/data recovery effort and curation of any significant artifact collections made.	

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Cultural Resources (continued)			
Impact CUL-1 (continued)	Significant	<p>CUL-3: Health and Safety Code 7050.5, CEQA 15064.5(e) and Public Resources Code 5097.98 mandate the process to be followed in the unlikely event of an unanticipated discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery. If human remains are found at the proposed project site, the following measures shall be implemented per the California Office of Historic Preservation Technical Assistance Bulletin 10 (46):</p> <p>...ground-disturbing activities in the area of the discovery shall immediately be halted or redirected. A temporary construction exclusion zone will be established surrounding the site to allow for further examination and treatment of the find. A project representative shall immediately notify the Ventura County Coroner's office by telephone. By law, the Coroner will determine within two working days of being notified if the remains are subject to his or her authority. If the coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission who will appoint the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). Additionally, if the bones are determined to be Native American, a plan will be developed regarding the treatment of human remains and associated burial objects and the plan will be implemented under the direction of the MLD [California 2001].</p>	Less than significant
Hazards			
Impact HAZ-1: Fire Hazards. Projects located within a high fire hazard area.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact HAZ-2: Hazardous Materials. Result in significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact HAZ-3: Hazardous Wastes. Result in significant hazard to the public or environment associated with the storage, handling, or disposal of hazardous wastes.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact HAZ-4: Petroleum Wastes. Exposure of soils (or associated soil gas) containing toxic substances and petroleum hydrocarbons, associated with prior oil field operations, would be deleterious to humans, based on regulatory standards established by the lead agency for the site.	Significant	<p>HAZ-1: Compliance with California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) Standards. Grading associated with landfill expansion shall include the following requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All on-site oil wells shall be abandoned pursuant to current abandonment/re-abandonment requirements, and all grading shall be completed, in accordance with DOGGR Construction Project Site Review and Well Abandonment Procedures, as well as site-specific instructions from the DOGGR. 	Less than significant
		<p>HAZ-2: Locate and Mark Abandoned Wells. On-site abandoned wells shall be accurately located through surveying and marked with a post visible to equipment operators.</p>	

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Hazards (continued)			
Impact HAZ-4 (continued)	Significant	HAZ-3: Grading/Excavation Monitor. A qualified environmental engineer or environmental geologist shall be present during grading/excavations in the vicinity of on-site oil wells, to direct proper excavation and characterization of potentially contaminated materials. The qualified environmental engineer shall observe excavations for potential signs of contaminated soil, such as discoloration, unusual odors, and/or positive readings with a photo-ionization detector (PID) or organic vapor analyzer (OVA). The environmental engineer or environmental geologist shall be 40-hour Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) -trained with respect to handling of hazardous substances. Contaminated soil shall be excavated and disposed off-site at a facility permitted for disposal of such waste. Alternatively, the contaminated soil may be remediated in-situ (i.e., in-place) by bioremediation or other methods acceptable to the Ventura County Environmental Health Division.	Less than significant
Impact HAZ 5: Valley Fever. Project construction or operation must not cause adverse impacts to public health.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Noise and Vibration			
Impact NOI-1: Construction Noise. Project construction related must not exceed established noise limits.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact NOI-2: Operational Noise. Project operation related noise must not exceed established noise limits.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact NOI-3: Operational Vibration. The Project would have a significant vibration impact if it would result in detectable vibration at sensitive land uses.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Transportation and Circulation Transportation and Circulation			
Impact TR-1: Freeway or Roadway Segments. Project related traffic must not cause the LOS of the study freeway or roadway segment to fall below LOS C, or, if already below C, to fall to a lower LOS.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact TR-2: Intersections. Project related traffic must not cause the LOS of a study intersection to fall below LOS C and the project trips to exceed 50 percent of the remaining capacity at the study intersection.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Transportation and Circulation (continued)			
Impact TR-3: Somis Road and SR-118 Intersection. Project related traffic must not add one future PHT to the intersection of Somis Road and SR-118 unless there is a commitment to road improvements that ensure that the impact will be reduced to an acceptable LOS in a reasonable period of time.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Water Supply			
Impact WS-1: Water Supply-Quality. The quality of domestic water available to development must be in compliance with the applicable State Drinking Water Standards, as described in Title 22 of the CCR, §65521 et eq.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact WS-2. Water Supply-Quantity. Does not provide a permanent supply of water. A permanent supply of water is defined as at least a 60 year supply. A spring does not meet the requirement for a permanent source of water supply.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Waste Treatment and Disposal			
Impact WT-1: Individual Sewage Disposal System. A project is not in compliance with applicable sections of the following documents: Ventura County Building Code, Ventura County Sewer Policy, Ventura County Ordinance Code, Uniform Plumbing Code, Environmental Health Division Individual Sewage Disposal System Technical Information Manual, and Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant
Impact WT-2: Solid Waste Facility. Fails to comply with statutes, regulations, ordinances, and policies for solid waste facilities; or if it would impact the demand for solid waste disposal capacity in Ventura County such that there would be less than 15 years of disposal capacity available for county disposal.	Less than significant	None necessary.	Less than significant

Table ES.7-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Recreational Facilities			
Impact REC-1: Local Parks/Facilities. Cause an increase in the demand for recreation when measured against the following standard: five acres of developable land (less than 15 percent slope) per 1,000 population.	Significant	REC-1: The applicant shall pay in lieu fees for local parks/facilities that would ensure that the applicant would offset costs of developing and/or making improvements to local recreation amenities associated with increased recreational demands from the proposed project. These fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.	Less than significant
Impact REC-2: Regional Parks/Facilities. Cause an increase in the demand for recreation when measured against the following standard: five acres of developable land per 1,000 population.	Significant	REC-2: The applicant shall pay in lieu fees for regional parks/facilities that would offset costs of developing and/or making improvements to regional recreation amenities associated with increased recreational demands from the proposed project. These fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.	Less than significant
Impact REC-3: Regional Trails/Corridors. Cause an increase in the demand for recreation when measured against the following standard: two-and-a-half miles per 1,000 population.	Significant	REC-3: The applicant shall dedicate public easements for the Alamos Canyon Trail that would link the trail with the proposed trail network for Simi Valley. New trail easements shall be aligned with existing dirt roads/trails to the greatest extent feasible. Development adjacent to the Alamos Canyon Trail shall include, where appropriate, the construction and assurance of the fitness of designated trails for two years, at which time the agency(ies) being dedicated the public easements would assume maintenance responsibility. Where immediate construction is not required, a construction bond shall be required. If dedication of the trail link easement comprises less than the project related-demand, the applicant shall pay in lieu fees to offset the remainder of the increased demand for trail miles. Any in lie fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.	Less than significant
Impact REC-4: Future Development. Cause an increase in the demand for recreation when measured against the following standard: impede future development of Recreation Parks/Facilities and/or Regional Trails/Corridors.	Significant	See REC-1 through REC-3 .	Less than significant