

**NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT**

The County of Ventura, Resource Management Agency, Planning Division, currently is processing an application for a Major Modification to the Conditional Use Permit for the Simi Valley Landfill and Recycling Center, as described below. The Planning Division completed an Initial Study for the proposed project and determined that the proposed project (individually and cumulatively) may have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. A Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and is available for review, as described below.

Entitlement: Major Modification Application Case No. LU07-0048; Related Conditional Use Permit Case No. CUP-3142.

Applicant/Owner: Waste Management of California, Inc.

Location: The project site is located within the unincorporated area of Ventura County, north of the City of Simi Valley, at 2801 Madera Road. The project site entrance is located approximately 1,500 feet west of Madera Road, and adjacent to State Route 118.

Assessor Parcel Nos.: 615-160-01, -13, -28, -44, -46 & 615-150-24, -25, -29, -30, -32, -33

Parcel Size: 1,487.468 acres (total)

General Plan Designation: Open Space/Open Space Urban Reserve

Existing Zoning: OS-160 ac (Open Space, 160 acre minimum lot size) and AE-40 ac (Agricultural Exclusive, 40 acre minimum lot size).

Responsible and/or Trustee Agencies: California Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Integrated Waste Management Board, California Department of Transportation, California Department of Fish and Game.

Project Description: The project consists of an application for a Major Modification (No. 8) to Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Case No. 3142, in order to allow: additional recycling facilities; consolidation of local refuse and recycling collection operations; a lateral and vertical expansion of existing landfill operations; and, an extension of the disposal capacity and life of the landfill. The current daily tonnage limit for all materials entering the landfill (disposal tons and recyclables) is proposed to remain at 9,250 tons per day (TPD); however, the allocation of material types would change from 3,000 TPD of material for disposal and 6,250 TPD of recyclable material, to 6,000 TPD of material for disposal and 3,250 TPD of recyclable material.

The project also includes the consolidation of the applicants' existing facilities by relocating the applicants' waste hauling yard (which is currently located at 195 W. Los Angeles Avenue, in the City of Simi Valley) to the project site. In order to accommodate the consolidation of the facilities, the applicant is proposing to construct: office and maintenance buildings; a Material Recovery Facility/Recyclables Transfer Facility; a household hazardous waste collection facility; an environmental education center; construction and demolition processing area; a new landfill gas to liquefied natural gas facility; and, an expansion of the existing landfill gas to energy program to include three additional generators and an expansion of the green waste recycling area. The landfill footprint would be expanded to a total of 371 acres for waste disposal and the CUP boundary would



expand to a total of 887 acres, including a 516-acre buffer area surrounding the proposed disposal footprint.

Listing of Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts Identified: The Draft EIR identified unavoidably significant impacts relating to air quality, agricultural resources, paleontological resources, and visual resources. The Draft EIR also identified potentially significant but mitigable impacts relating to flood hazards, biological resources, glare, archaeological resources, hazardous materials, demand for housing, and recreational facilities.

Availability of the Draft EIR: A copy of the Draft EIR is available on-line at <http://www.ventura.org/rma/planning/ceqa/eir.html>. A copy of the Draft EIR is also available at the Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Planning Division, which is located at the Ventura County Government Center, Hall of Administration, 800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura CA 93009.

The public review period for the Draft EIR is from September 28, 2009, to November 11, 2009. If you would like to submit written comments on the Draft EIR for consideration as part of the Final EIR, you must submit the written comments by no later than 5:00 PM on November 11, 2009, to Becky Linder, the Case Planner, at:

Mailing Address

Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Planning Division
Attn.: Ms. Becky Linder
800 South Victoria Avenue, L#1740
Ventura, CA 93009-1740

Email Address

becky.linder@ventura.org

Please contact Becky Linder via e-mail at becky.linder@ventura.org or by calling her at (805) 654-2469 if you have any questions about, or would like to receive a copy of, the Draft EIR.



Dan Klemann, M.A., Manager
Commercial and Industrial Permits Section

9/23/09
Date

FILED

DATE: SEP 25 2009
JAMES B. BECKER
Assistant County Clerk and Recorder
By: Yvonne Cabral Deputy

POSTED
SEP 25 2009

JAMES B. BECKER
Assistant County Clerk and Recorder

By: Deputy

Table 5.4-1. Alternatives Screening Analysis

Alternative	Ability of Applicant and/or County to Implement	Potential to Reduce Project Environmental Impacts ¹	Economic Potential
Scoring	1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good	1 = low; 2 = moderate; 3 = high	1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = viable
<i>Offsite Alternatives</i>			
Expand Toland Road Landfill	Neither the applicant nor the County has the authority to expand the Toland Road Landfill: Score = 1 (poor)	Expanding the Toland Road Landfill would likely involve impacts comparable to the proposed project: Score = 1 (low)	Unknown costs, although they are likely to be similar to those associated with the proposed project: Score = 2 (fair)
Develop new West County Landfill	Neither the applicant nor the County has the authority to develop a West County Landfill: Score = 1 (poor)	Developing a West County Landfill would likely involve impacts comparable to the proposed project: Score = 1 (low)	Costs associated with permitting and constructing a new landfill would be substantial: Score = 1 (poor)
Transport waste out of County	Neither the applicant nor the County has the authority to develop the requisite transfer facilities: Score = 1 (poor)	Developing multiple County transfer facilities would likely involve impacts comparable to or greater than the proposed project: Score = 1 (low)	Costs associated with permitting and constructing multiple new transfer facilities would be substantial: Score = 1 (poor)
Multiple local incinerators	Neither the applicant nor the County has the authority to develop the requisite facilities: Score = 1 (poor)	Developing multiple incineration facilities would likely involve impacts comparable to or greater than the proposed project: Score = 1 (low)	Costs associated with permitting and constructing multiple incineration facilities would be substantial: Score = 1 (poor)
<i>Alternative Landfill Configurations</i>			
Reduce Vertical Height	The applicant has the ability to implement a reduced vertical height alternative and the County could impose a limit by permit condition: Score = 3 (good)	Reducing the overall height of the landfill would reduce the visual effects. It would also reduce impact to resources, such as traffic and air emissions, due to reduced amount of MSW being sent to and processed at the facility: Score = 2 (moderate)	Reducing the overall height of the landfill would reduce the ultimate capacity of the landfill. While this would not reduce near term revenues, it would reduce overall revenues for the applicant: Score = 2 (fair)
Reduce Footprint	The applicant has the ability to implement a reduced footprint alternative and the County could impose a limit by permit condition: Score = 3 (good)	Reducing the overall footprint of the landfill would reduce impacts to some sensitive habitats and species. In addition, reduction in the amount of MSW being sent to and processed at the facility would reduce impacts to resources including air and traffic: Score = 2 (moderate)	Reducing the footprint of the landfill would reduce the ultimate capacity of the landfill by a greater amount than reducing its height and reduce overall revenues for the applicant by a greater amount than reducing the height: Score = 1 (poor)

Table 5.4-1. Alternatives Screening Analysis

Alternative	Ability of Applicant and/or County to Implement	Potential to Reduce Project Environmental Impacts ¹	Economic Potential
Scoring	1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good	1 = low; 2 = moderate; 3 = high	1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = viable
Anaerobic Bioreactor	The applicant has the ability to implement anaerobic bioreactor technology and such a facility would be consistent with current operations (e.g. landfill gas to energy generation): Score = 3 (good)	<i>Alternative On-Site Technologies</i> Anaerobic bioreactor technology would replace portions of one or more phases. The key virtue of this technology is more rapid degradation of waste such that each bioreactor cell would decompose (and compact) more rapidly, allowing more waste to be accepted into the same physical space. However, it would require substantial additional water to maintain the process: Score = 2 (moderate)	Anaerobic bioreactor technology is more expensive to operate and monitor than a standard landfill: Score = 2 (fair)
Aerobic Bioreactor	Aerobic bioreactor technology is not compatible with current operations since it does not produce landfill gas in sufficient quantities: Score = 1 (poor)	Aerobic bioreactor technology would replace one or more phases. It would result in more rapid decomposition and compaction of waste than anaerobic technology, but would also require more water to maintain the process: Score = 2 (moderate)	Aerobic bioreactor technology is considerably more expensive to operate and monitor than either anaerobic technology or a standard landfill: Score = 1 (poor)
Thermal Incinerator	Thermal incinerator technology is problematic due to air pollution control permit concerns: Score = 1 (poor)	Thermal incinerator technology would reduce the residual volume of waste from the landfill, but the residual ash would need to be disposed of conventionally. Air pollutant emissions are a concern: Score = 1 (low)	Thermal incinerator technology is considerably more expensive to operate and monitor than either anaerobic technology or a standard landfill as well as more costly to permit: Score = 1 (poor)
Thermochemical Technology	Thermochemical technology is problematic due to air pollution control permit concerns as well as end uses of the intermediate products that result and for which marketability is unknown: Score = 1 (poor)	Thermochemical technology would reduce the residual volume of waste from the landfill, but the residual non-degradable material would need to be disposed of conventionally. Air pollutant emissions are a concern: Score = 1 (low)	Thermochemical technology is considerably more expensive than either anaerobic technology or a standard landfill as well as more costly to permit. In addition, a market must exist for the intermediate products: Score = 1 (poor)

Table 5.4-1. Alternatives Screening Analysis

Alternative	Ability of Applicant and/or County to Implement	Potential to Reduce Project Environmental Impacts ¹	Economic Potential
Score Range	1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good	1 = low; 2 = moderate; 3 = high	1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = viable
Education Program	Alternative Policy & Permit Options Either the County or the applicant could develop a public education program: Score = 2 (fair)	It is unclear what the environmental consequences of an education program would be or how effective such a program could be in reducing waste coming to the landfill; Score = 1 (low)	While costs for a public outreach program are unknown, they are expected to be considerable. Both the development and dissemination via media and other avenues are generally costly: Score = 1 (poor)
Change California Policies	While both the applicant and the County could propose and participate in the political process to change California policies, neither is in a position to ensure that suitable policies would be adopted: Score = 1 (poor)	It is unclear what the environmental consequences of a change in California policies would be or how effective they would be in reducing waste coming to the landfill; Score = 1 (low)	While costs for sustained political activity are unknown, they are expected to be considerable. Both the development of policy proposals and their continued pursuit can be costly: Score = 1 (poor)
Graduated Increase in MSW Permit Limit	Both the County (through the land use permit process) and the applicant are able to implement a graduated permit limit: Score = 3 (good)	A graduated permit limit would reduce near-term receipts of waste at the SVLRC by an unknown amount, but would not, by itself, reduce or eliminate environmental impacts: Score = 1 (low)	Reducing near term receipts at the landfill would impose a modest cost on the applicant by constraining potential near-term revenues. It would not likely alter total revenues over time: Score = 2 (fair)
Wasteshed Boundary	The County is not in a position to impose a geographic wasteshed boundary without violating the commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution: Score = 1 (poor)	A wasteshed boundary would reduce the rate at which waste is received at the SVLRC by an unknown amount, but would not, by itself, reduce or eliminate environmental impacts: Score = 1 (low)	Reducing receipts at the landfill would impose a modest cost on the applicant by constraining potential revenues. If the landfill remained unfilled at required closure, the applicant could experience lower overall revenues: Score = 2 (fair)
Graduated Surcharge	The County could legally impose an out-of-area surcharge by permit condition and the applicant could accept such a condition: Score = 3 (good)	An out-of-area surcharge would reduce the rate at which waste is received at the SVLRC, but would not, by itself, reduce or eliminate environmental impacts: Score = 1 (low)	Reducing receipts at the landfill would impose a modest cost on the applicant by constraining potential revenues. If the landfill remained unfilled at required closure, the applicant could experience lower overall revenues: Score = 2 (fair)
<i>Note.</i> 1. This analysis considers project-level impacts. It does not consider the project's contribution to cumulative impacts.			

Table 5.4-2. Alternatives Screening Scoring Summary

Alternative	Ability of Applicant and County to Implement	Potential to Reduce Project Environmental Impacts	Economic Potential	Overall Feasibility
Scoring	A 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good	B 1 = low 2 = moderate 3 = high	C 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = viable	= A + B + C
<i>Offsite Alternatives</i>				
Expand Toland Road Landfill	1	1	2	4
Develop new West County Landfill	1	1	1	3
Transport waste out of County	1	1	1	3
Multiple local incinerators	1	1	1	3
<i>Alternative Landfill Configurations</i>				
Reduce Vertical Height	3	2	2	7
Reduce Footprint	3	2	1	6
<i>Alternative On-Site Technologies</i>				
Anaerobic Bioreactor	3	2	2	7
Aerobic Bioreactor	1	2	1	4
Thermal Incinerator	1	1	1	3
Thermochemical Technology	1	1	1	3
<i>Alternative Policy & Permit Options</i>				
Education Program	2	1	1	4
Change California Policies	1	1	1	3
Graduated Increase in MSW Permit Limit	3	1	2	6
Wasteshed Boundary	1	1	2	4
Graduated Surcharge	3	1	2	6

5.5 Alternatives Selected for Impact Assessment

Consistent with the *State CEQA Guidelines* (§15126) requirements that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to a proposed Project that attain most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, the following sections describe the alternatives selected for impact assessment along with the proposed project and their associated environmental effects. As required by CEQA, the No Project Alternative is also described. As Section 5.4 concluded, the following alternatives are considered reasonably representative of the range of alternatives available:

- Alternative 1: Reduced Landfill Capacity Alternative
- Alternative 2: Anaerobic Bioreactor Technology Alternative
- Alternative 3: Phased Permitted Daily Tonnage Limit Alternative
- Alternative 4: Graduated Surcharge Alternative
- Alternative 5: No Project Alternative

In the following sections, each alternative is described with emphasis on those aspects of the alternative that differ substantially from the proposed project. Based on the description, the potential impacts of the alternative in comparison to the proposed project are discussed for each environmental issue area of concern.

5.5.1 Alternative 1: Reduced Landfill Capacity Alternative

There are two primary ways to reduce the overall capacity of the landfill, thereby reducing its expected lifespan by reducing its ultimate capacity. One is to reduce the proposed maximum permitted height of the landfill. The other is to reduce the area it covers (the footprint). In either case, the volume of material that can