

COUNTY OF NAPA
 CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT
 1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210
 NAPA, CA 94559
 (707) 253-4416

Initial Study Checklist
 (form updated September 2010)

1. **Project Title & Number:** Clover Flat Resource Recovery Park - Use Permit Major Modification # P09-00511-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** Vista Corporation
3. **County Contact:** Ronald Gee, AICP, Project Planner
Phone number and email: (707) 253-4417, ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project location and APN's:** The project involves modification of operations within an approximately 2.14 acre area at the southeast portion of the existing 78 acre Clover Flat Landfill, located on a 179.97 acre parcel, approximately 0.38 mile (2,000 feet) north of Silverado Trail and 1.0 mile east of Dunaweal Lane, within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 020-120-020 and -021) 4380 Clover Flat Road, Calistoga, CA 94515.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Vista Corporation, 1285 Whitehall Lane, St. Helena, CA 94574
6. **General Plan Designation:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space), *Napa County General Plan*, 2008
7. **Zoning District:** AW (Agricultural Watershed)
8. **Description of the Project:** In operation since 1963, Clover Flat Landfill (CFL) is an existing Class III municipal solid waste facility that services northern Napa County within the boundaries of the Zone 1 - Upper Valley Waste Management Authority jurisdiction which includes the Cities of Calistoga, St. Helena, Yountville and portions of unincorporated Napa County (not including Lake Berryessa). The CFL has a permitted operational area of 78 acres with a 48 acre disposal area. On-site activities include materials separation, recycling, green-waste composting, waste disposal, landfill gas recovery and power generation. Up to 600 tons per day of material can be accepted at the landfill with a maximum traffic volume of 275 vehicles per day. Hours of operation are from 9:00 AM – 4:00 PM, Tuesday-Saturday and 9:00 AM - 3:00 PM on Sundays. The permitted lifetime of the facility includes an expected 2021 closure date.

The project consists of the following modifications to existing landfill and recycling operations with the addition of a new biomass power generator to facilitate conversion of the landfill to a resource recovery park. The proposal would:

- 1) Gate Operations (Landfill entrance staging area including administrative offices, weigh station, recycling, material separation and power generation facilities):
 - a) Relocate the existing Gate Operations area northwest of its current location at the entrance to the main landfill facility;
 - b) Expand the size of the Gate Operations and Recycling Operations areas from 1.4 acres to 2.1 acres;
 - c) Increase the permitted Solid Waste Facility boundary by 1.0 acre (79.0 acre total) to accommodate the new Recycling Operations area; and
 - d) Permit grading in the proposed gate operations area of 70,000 cubic yards (CY) of cut material to create the proposed 2.1 acre Recycling Operations area.
- 2) Landfill Operations:
 - a) Extend the landfill closure date from 2021 to 2047 due to increased recycling, increased compaction and the use of synthetic tarpaulins as alternative daily cover;
 - b) Decrease the permitted size of the total disposal area / landfill capacity from 5.1 million cubic yards to 4.9 million cubic yards in a discrete location;
 - c) Amend the approved Final Fill Plan (landfill design) to allow the existing concrete operations pad to remain in place; and
 - d) Allow use of new inert alternative daily cover (ADC) material types including glass chards and diatomaceous earth.
- 3) Recycling Operations:
 - a) Relocate the existing, canopied mixed-recycling processing line (i.e., material recovery facility or MRF) from its current staging area to the new Gate Operations area;

- b) Expand in-vessel food waste composting and food waste transfer and processing operations;
 - c) Increase the storage area of recyclable materials on-site;
 - d) Add a series of commodity bunkers for wood chips, compost, top soil blends, aggregate materials, and landscape materials for the general public to purchase recycled materials.
- 4) Renewable Energy Facilities:
- a) Add a Biomass Conversion Facility (power generation plant) that will use 40 tons per day of clean, processed wood waste in a gasification unit to produce one mega-watt/day of renewable energy for on-site use and off-site sales.

Other than expansion of the existing gateway and recycling operations area, no other physical changes to the CFL are proposed as part of this Use Permit application, as there will be minor or no changes to the following operations: tonnage amount or waste types; traffic counts; employees; operating hours; disposal footprint of the landfill.

Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses: Clover Flat landfill is located in northern Napa County off the Silverado Trail about three miles east of the City of Calistoga. The developed disposal area is now approximately 36 acres. The project involves operational and physical changes that would occur primarily in the southeast portion of the landfill where the gate operations and mixed recycling operations are now located. An existing, approximately 0.68 mile (3,600 feet) long paved driveway provides access to the subject parcel and project site from the north side of Silverado Trail. The subject parcel is bordered to the west, east and north by undeveloped land and, to the south, by Silverado Trail are rural residences. Silverado Trail is identified as a Scenic Roadway in the Napa County General Plan and in the County's Viewshed Protection Program (N.C.C. Chapter 18.106).

General topography of the area is steeply-sloping (i.e., slopes typically 30% – 75% grade). Elevations range from 600 - 1,100 feet MSL in the hills on the eastern side of Napa Valley, between Dutch Henry Canyon and Simmons Canyon. Foundation materials consist of Sonoma Volcanic rhyolitic rocks and tuff, overlain by Class VII soils of the Hambright-Rock outcrop complex. Runoff is rapid to very rapid with high; erosion hazard. Three small landslides (two of which are mapped as "questionable" by USGS) are located on the adjacent parcel also owned by the applicant. Vegetative cover is primarily California mixed evergreen and chaparral.

The project site is located in the Maple Lane Area drainage. An unnamed ephemeral stream is located approximately 400 feet to the east of the landfill's final waste footprint; Dutch Henry Creek is located approximately 0.7 mile to the east of the project site. The subject parcel and project area do not drain directly into this unnamed tributary or Dutch Henry Creek. An extensive system of surface drainage facilities and sedimentation control devices, designed to meet a specific timed intensity for a 100-year return storm event, control stormwater runoff that ultimately diverts around the landfill to the natural drainage from the canyon.

Surrounding land uses include undeveloped land, rural residential, vineyard and wineries. The nearest residence to the project site is located approximately 0.39 mile (2,000 feet) south of the project site; the next closest residence is 0.46 mile (2,440 feet) east of the project site. The two nearest wineries are located between 0.5 - 0.75 mile east of the project site (Dutch Henry Winery with a production capacity of 20,000 gallons/year and Hour Glass Winery with a production capacity of 70,000 gallons/year). St. Helena Hospital is located approximately 5 miles to the southeast. The nearest school is Harvest Christian Academy located approximately one mile to the northwest.

Existing land use for the project is a Class III municipal solid waste disposal facility with accessory buildings. The landfill is a canyon-type landfill, where the canyon floor and side slopes are excavated to allow placement of base liners to provide a refuse disposal area and to provide excess soil for use as daily, intermediate and final cover. Wastes accepted include municipal solid waste consisting of residential trash and rubbish, commercial and non-hazardous industrial refuse, demolition and construction waste, brush and stumps, large appliances, tires, street refuse, de-watered, non-hazardous sewage sludge from the City of Calistoga Water Treatment Plant (sludge with less than 50% liquid) and occasionally, de-watered grape pomace.

10. Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

Napa County Department of Environmental Management
 Napa County Public Works Department
 Upper Valley Waste Management Authority
 California Department of Fish & Game
 California Department of Resources, Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) / Local Enforcement Agency (LEA)
 California Division of Forestry - Fire
 Bay Area Air Quality Management District
 San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the area; and, where necessary, a visit to the site. For further information, see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

November 1, 2011

Date

Name: Ronald Gee, Project Planner

Napa County Conservation, Development & Planning Department

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: November 3, 2011 to December 2, 2011.

Please send written comments to the attention of: Napa County Conservation, Development & Planning Department, c/o Ronald Gee, AICP, Project Planner, 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, CA 94559 or via e-mail to ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org.

A public hearing is tentatively scheduled before the Napa County Conservation, Development & Planning Commission at 9:00 AM or later on Wednesday, **December 7, 2011**. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4417.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not be located within an area visible from any known scenic vista. Potential scenic vistas in Napa County are views from its scenic designated public roadways which are considered significant visual resources for its residents and visitors (*Napa County General Plan*, June 2008, *Community Character: CC-8, CC-9 & CC-10*). The Napa County Viewshed Ordinance applies to all projects proposed for development on any major or minor ridge, knoll or bench with slopes greater than 15% that are within view of a designated scenic public roadway.

The landfill modifications are proposed within the previously-disturbed Clover Flat Landfill permitted boundary with an additional 1.0 acre area in the proposed expanded Landfill boundary. Expansion of the landfill boundary is needed to accommodate the new 2.1 acre gate and recycling operations area which will be created by cutting into the hillside to the south of the existing gatehouse. The average slope of the proposed disturbed area is located on slopes greater than 15%. Silverado Trail is the only designated scenic public roadway in the vicinity of the project and is located on the valley floor along the southern boundary of the parcel. However, the cut area is located behind an intervening ridge which blocks it from view of the traveling public. Therefore, the proposed development area is not subject to the Napa County Viewshed Ordinance. Since the proposed project will not be seen by the traveling public along Silverado Trail, no substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista will result.

- b. The proposed project is not located within a designated State scenic highway. The proposed project is located approximately 2,000 feet north of Silverado Trail, a County road listed as a Scenic Roadway in the Community Character Element of the Napa County General Plan; as mentioned above, the site is not visible from the public roadway since it is separated by intervening hills. The proposed area for development does not include any historic structures. Removal of trees in the cut area will not diminish the existing views from any designated scenic roadways because an intervening ridge blocks this area from view of the traveling public. A mitigation measure in Section II. Agriculture and Forest Resources, requires replacement of trees removed for the expanded gateway operations area according to a specific tree mitigation planting plan that will result in a less than significant impact. The proposed project would not result in damage to scenic resources and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Community Character Element for Scenic Roadways in the Napa County General Plan.

- c. The area proposed for development is located on the parcel in such a manner that it will not be viewed from the nearest road. The closest residence is located on the property approximately 0.39 mile (2,000 feet) south of the project. The new cut area will be subject to an erosion control plan that will require re-vegetation. Re-vegetating the area reduces the degree and duration of the visual impacts to a less-than-significant level. As stated above, a condition of approval for tree replacement at a 2:1 basis will act to restore and further enhance the area. The project includes the installation of a biomass conversion facility and three micro-turbines in the existing disturbed area of the landfill where previously approved landfill activities are currently taking place. The three micro-turbines, covering a 70 feet x 27 feet (1,890 square feet), will be located in a depressed area northeast of the existing gate house. The biomass conversion facility will cover an approximately 50 feet x 100 feet area (5,000 square feet) area located above the gate house where the construction and demolition (C&D) processing area is currently located. Both of these facilities cover a small area and are within the existing disturbed landfill area. Other structures that are similar in size are already on-site. Therefore, these modifications to the existing landfill character are considered negligible and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

- d. The micro-turbine and biomass facility will be lighted for minimum safety and security which may potentially result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. However, as stated in the previously approved Use Permit # U-438889 Conditions of Approval, adopted on June 20, 1990 and incorporated herein by reference: "*Lighting shall be focused away from sensitive receptors and lighting elements shall be placed as low as possible to limit extent of visibility.*" In addition, standard conditions of approval require that all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for the operational and security needs. Highly reflective surfaces are required to be avoided. All lighting shall comply with the current California

International Building Code. With the inclusion of the previous and current standard conditions of approval, the project will not create a new source of new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Mitigation Measure(s): None

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The entire landfill site is located outside of any areas designated as Prime Farmland based on California Department of Conservation Farmlands 2006 mapping. All proposed changes, except for an additional 1.0 acre gateway operation expansion area, would take place within a permitted 78 acre landfill facility on a 179.97 acre site. No conversion of any designated Farmland areas would result from the project.
- b. The zoning designation for the project site is Agricultural Watershed (AW) District with a land use designation of Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space on the Napa County General Plan Land Use Map. AW District zoning allows Sanitary Landfill Sites upon grant of a use permit. The site is currently developed with an existing Class III municipal solid waste landfill facility which includes on-site recycling, green-waste composting and power-generation facilities. The proposal relocates and expands existing gate operations and recycling facilities and adds a new biomass conversion facility. Existing and proposed development on this site is consistent with existing AW District zoning for allowed agricultural uses upon use permit approval. This site is not under Williamson Act contract. Since there is neither a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use nor a Williamson contract on the parcel, a less than significant impact will result.
- c. No conversion of farmland would result from this project and would be considered less than significant. The existing landfill facility has operated at this location since 1963. This proposal contains no changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use, resulting in a less than significant impact.
- d. As stated in the attached Questa Engineering Corp., *Tree Mitigation Planting Plan – Clover Flat Landfill Recycling Facility Expansion, February 22, 2011*, more than 900 trees are located in the proposed 2.1 acre gate operations expansion area. The stand is over-stocked with young, sapling trees with many large or mature Coast Live Oak, Valley Oak and Douglas Fir trees, some with diameters over 20 inches.

¹ "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Game, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

Many of the young trees are suppressed and will die as they become over-topped (shaded) by more vigorous native trees. Mortality of young trees in over-stocked stands on dry sites like these are quite high and are prone to intense crown fires that would typically destroy most of the trees.

The proposed gate operations area expansion from 1.0 to 2.1 acres includes cut-and-fill of 70,000 cubic yards of material to create a level bench in an area of steep, forested slopes. The tree survey report found that approximately 392 native trees and large tree-like shrubs over 6-inch diameter at breast height (dbh) would be removed for the expansion. The report stated that a healthy sustainable tree cover in this area is approximately 100 trees per acre; the 2:1 replacement rate required by Napa County ordinance would not be feasible given the current overgrowth in the affected area. Recommended replanting of a mix of native trees and shrubs includes Blue Oak, Black Oak, Coast Live Oak, Valley Oak, Douglas Fir, Foothill Pine and other native species. Replanted understory species would include Buckeye, Elderberry, Manzanita and Toyon. Additional wildlife habitat elements would also be constructed within the mitigation areas including wildlife brush piles, placement of large woody debris or downed large logs, and shallow, un-drained water basins. These improvements would be maintained and monitored for a minimum five years, beginning at the time of planting and extending until the number of trees agreed upon has been successfully established. Replanting would occur in three open, previously-disturbed, landfill operations areas; on-site mitigation planting areas will restore 1.0 acre, 0.55 acre and 0.55 acre areas. These mitigation measures require California Department of Forestry review and approval for timberland conversion of the 1.1 acre expansion area. All other proposed landfill operational changes would take place within the already-permitted 78 acre landfill area. With the proposed tree canopy and understory replanting mitigation plan, the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits.

- e. All other proposed landfill operational changes would take place within the already-permitted 78 acre landfill area and would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measure(s):

- 1) The Tree Mitigation Planting Plan identified in the Questa Engineering Corp., *Tree Mitigation Planting Plan – Clover Flat Landfill Recycling Facility Expansion, February 22, 2011*, including replacement tree canopy species, understory species with wildlife habitat enhancements and minimum five-year monitoring of improvements, shall be fully implemented prior to initiation of Use Permit Major Modification # P09-00511-MOD uses.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III.	AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
	a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A Note on Greenhouse Gasses

Operation and construction of the project analyzed in this initial study would contribute to overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by generating emissions associated with transportation to and from the site, emissions from energy used within buildings, and emissions from the use of equipment. The project-specific increase in GHG emissions would be relatively modest, given the estimated average of 15 new vehicle trips per day, and increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements imposed as part of the building permit process.

Napa County has not yet adopted explicit thresholds of significance for GHG emissions, although the State has recently adopted changes to the State CEQA Guidelines which suggest that agencies may consider (among other factors) the extent to which a project complies with requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b) (3)).

Also, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has proposed compliance with a "qualified climate action plan" as a threshold of significance, along with a quantitative threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e/yr (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year) for land use projects.

Overall increases in green house gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update which was certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and "emission reduction framework" for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and is currently serving as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed. The relatively modest increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be well below the significance threshold suggested by BAAQMD. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Discussion:

- a. The project site lies within the north-central portion of the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically sensitive sub-regions (Napa County Sub-region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, and is consequently subject to the requirements of the BAAQMD. The project will not be in conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Ozone Maintenance Plan, Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan or the Bay Area 1991 Clean Air Plan, under the Federal Clean Air Act. BAAQMD regards emissions of fine particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), reactive organic gases (ROG) and carbon monoxide (CO) as pollutants from landfill operations to be less than significant if dust and particulate control measures are implemented, which are included in this project.

The BAAQMD has determined that land uses that generate fewer than 2,000 trips per day do not generally require detailed air quality analysis, since these land uses would not generally be expected to have potentially significant air quality impacts [specifically, they would not be expected to generate over 80 pounds/day (14.6 tons/year) of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)]. No change to the maximum 275 trips per day (TPD) for landfill operations, permitted under Use Permit # U-438889, is proposed. The 275 TPD are for peak daily activity but the facility has a historical and anticipated annual average of 175 TPD for its 310 days per year operation. When compared to the size of the affected air basin, the incremental increase in vehicle emissions from this level of traffic generation (including temporary construction and routine operations) from this project will not effectively change existing conditions.

After consultation with BAAQMD staff, the updated *Clover Flat Landfill, Inc. Draft Air Emissions Study, October, 20, 2011* (attached), was prepared to address the following emissions from the project: 1) Food waste (either landfilled or composted); 2) Green waste processed; 3) Landfill gas, either flared or converted to energy (using a General Electric Jenbacher Gas Engine, Model JGC 316, Approved as part of Use Permit Minor Modification # P10-00238-MOD); 4) Mobile and equipment emissions; and 4) New biomass gasification unit (either a CAT 3516 or Cummins 1710 engines). The new study includes additional analysis based on BAAQMD's updated May 2011 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines to address the project's "Significance Determination" quantification methodology. The Guidelines recommend subtracting existing emissions levels from the emissions levels estimated for the new land use; this net calculation is permissible only if existing emissions sources were operational when the CEQA document was initiated. In this case, existing green waste storage and food waste composting operations are addressed including additional information about the landfill gas flare/power converter approved as part of Use Permit Minor Modification # P10- 00328-MOD. The following scenarios were evaluated as part of the study: 1) Baseline emissions from entitled operations; 2) Baseline emissions from current operations; 3) Proposed emissions with emission controls; 4) Proposed emissions without controls; and 5) Net emissions from the project.

Attached background information includes: 1) Temporary construction emissions for the new operations area installation and on-site roadway construction based upon the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's ROADWAY Model output for road and construction emissions; 2) On-site equipment emissions; 3) Two-year operational review of the Upper Valley Recycling Food Waste Composting Program at CFL, September 30, 2011 including a green waste storage model that reduced 30-day storage to 28-days to reduce overall volatile organic compounds (VOCs) to less than 35 tons per year (tpy); and 4) CFL greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions based upon the URBEMIS land use emissions inventory model to estimate GHGs and criteria pollutant emissions under particular scenarios involving construction, area and other sources that identified on-site emissions for stationary and mobile GHGs.

Overall criteria pollutant emissions for all proposed CFL project activities are shown in the tables below. There are four scenarios distinguish between entitled baseline emissions, operational baseline emissions, food composting operations with controls instead of landfilling [including the Jenbacher engine (for landfill gas flare and energy conversion) and the biomass gasification unit installation, both with controls] and food waste composting without controls instead of landfilling [including the Jenbacher engine and biomass gasification unit installation, both with controls].

Scenario No. 1 – Entitled Baseline Scenario for Criteria Pollutants

Process	VOCs (tons/year)	NOx (tons/year)	PM (tons/year)	Sox (tons/year)	CO (tons/year)
Landfilled Food Waste ¹ (7,888 tons/year)	4.2	-	-	-	-
Green Waste Storage (4,000 TPY, 1,500 CY for 21 days)	44.6	-	-	-	-
Landfill Gas Flare	0.06	2.12	-	-	7.06
Mobile & Equipment ¹	0.05	0.8	0.03	-	1.02
Total	48.91	2.92	0.03	0	8.08

- 1 The landfilled food waste represents landfill gas emissions that would be avoided by implementation of the proposed full-scale food waste composting project.
- 2 After 2021, baseline mobile emissions would decrease because mobile emissions would decrease at the CFL is scheduled to stop under the current permit.

Scenario No. 2 – Operational Baseline Scenario Emissions for Criteria Pollutants

Process	VOCs (tons/year)	NOx (tons/year)	PM (tons/year)	Sox (tons/year)	CO (tons/year)
Food Waste Composting ¹ (881 tons/year)	1.28	-	-	-	-
Landfilled Food Waste ² (7,888 tons/year)	3.73	-	-	-	-
Green Waste Storage (4,000 tons/year, 1,500 cubic yards for 21 days)	63.80	-	-	-	-
Landfill Gas Flare	0.06	2.12	-	-	7.06
Mobile & Equipment ³	0.05	0.8	0.03	-	1.02
Total	68.92	2.92	0.03	0	8.08

- 1 The 881 tons is the average annual food waste throughput in the pilot-scale in-vessel composting project.
- 2 "Landfilled Food Waste" represents the emissions from the landfilled tons that would be avoided by implementation of the proposed full-scale food waste composting project (7,888 - 881 = 7,007 tons).
- 3 After 2021, baseline mobile emissions would decrease because landfill disposal at the CFL is scheduled to stop under the current permit.

Scenario No. 3 – Proposed Scenario Emissions for Criteria Pollutants with Biofiltration

Process	VOCs (tons/year)	NOx (tons/year)	PM (tons/year)	Sox (tons/year)	CO (tons/year)
Food Waste Composting (881 tons/year)	11.51	-	-	-	-
Green Waste Storage (8,000 tons/year, 6,000 cubic yards for 30 days with biofilter)	19.1	-	-	-	-
Biomass Gasification Unit	1.42	1.47	0.65	0.39	7.47
Mobile & Equipment ³	0.05	0.8	0.03	-	1.02

Total	35.50	9.07	0.68	0.39	36.83
-------	-------	------	------	------	-------

Scenario No. 4 – Proposed Scenario Emissions for Criteria Pollutants Without Biofiltration

Process	VOCs (tons/year)	NOx (tons/year)	PM (tons/year)	Sox (tons/year)	CO (tons/year)
Food Waste Composting (7,888 tons/year)	26.71	-	-	-	-
Green Waste Storage (8,000 tons/year includes co-collected organics, 6,000 cubic yards for 30 days, no biofilter)	127.6	-	-	-	-
Biomass Gasification Unit	1.42	1.47	0.65	0.39	7.47
Landfill Gas Energy (Jenbacher LFG Engine)	3.34	6.8	-	-	28.34
Mobile & Equipment ³	0.05	0.8	0.03	-	1.02
Total	158.82	9.07	0.68	0.39	36.83

The increased green waste storage and the food waste composting are existing operations. Food waste composting was authorized under a two-year research demonstration project by the County Local Enforcement Agency. Under this program, green waste storage has exceeded CFL entitled emission limits since a separate BAAQMD Authority to Construct permit was not secured for its operation. The Table below compares baseline operations to proposed project emissions with controls to yield net emissions.

Net Project Criteria Pollutant Emissions (Project with Controls – Entitled Baseline)

Category	VOCs (tons/year)	NOx (tons/year)	PM (tons/year)	Sox (tons/year)	CO (tons/year)
Net Emissions	-13.41	6.15	0.65	0.39	28.75
Thresholds of Significance	10	10	15	-	9.0 ppm (8-hour) 20 ppm (1-hour)

Overall GHG Emissions from both stationary and mobile sources for CFL project activities are shown below:

Entitled Baseline Scenario GHG Emissions – Stationary Sources

Process	Methane (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Nitrous Oxide (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Total (MTCO ₂ e/year)
Green Waste Storage ¹ (1,500 cubic yards for 21 days)	218	70	288
Fugitive Landfill Methane	4,775	0	4,775
Total	4,993	70	5,063

1 The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District emission factor for organic storage is used and the result is multiplied by 21/30 to account for the smaller storage period relative to the proposed 30 days.

Operational Baseline Scenario GHG Emissions – Stationary Sources

Process	Methane (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Nitrous Oxide (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Total (MTCO ₂ e/year)
Food Waste Composting (881 tons per year)	17	6	23
Green Waste Storage	312	100	412

(4,000 cubic yards for 21 days)			
Fugitive Landfill Methane	4,521	0	4,521
Total	4,850	106	4,956

Proposed Scenario GHG Emissions with Biofiltration – Stationary Sources

Process	Methane (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Nitrous Oxide (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Total (MTCO ₂ e/year)
Food Waste Composting (7,888 tons per year)	154	49	203
Green Waste Storage (6,000 cubic yards for 30 days)	94	30	124
Fugitive Landfill Methane	5,409	0	5,409
Total	5,657	79	5,736

Proposed Scenario GHG Emissions without Biofiltration – Stationary Sources

Process	Methane (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Nitrous Oxide (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Total (MTCO ₂ e/year)
Food Waste Composting (7,888 tons per year)	615	197	812
Green Waste Storage (6,000 cubic yards for 30 days)	624	200	824
Fugitive Landfill Methane	5,409	0	5,409
Total	6,648	397	7,045

Net Project GHG Emissions – Stationary Sources (Project with Controls – Entitled Baseline)

Category	Methane (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Nitrous Oxide (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Total (MTCO ₂ e/year)
Net Emissions	664	9	673

Entitled Baseline Scenario GHG Emissions – Mobile Sources

Category	Methane (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Nitrous Oxide (MTCO ₂ e/year)	Total (MTCO ₂ e/year)
Mobile & Equipment ¹	1,162	-	1,162

- 1 After 2021, baseline mobile emissions would decrease because landfill disposal at the CFL is scheduled to stop under the current permit.

The number of vehicles accessing the facility is not expected to change until 2021. The baseline scenario is for the CFL to reach capacity in 2021 (under the current permit) while the proposed project scenario extends available capacity to 2044; the same amount of traffic will be generated for a longer period of time. In the updated Air Emissions Study, these two scenarios are compared using 2011 as a base year.

Baseline Emissions = (1,162 MTCO₂e) (2021-2011) = 11,620 MTCO₂e

Proposed Project Emissions + (1,162 MTCO₂e) (2044-2011) = 38,346 MTCO₂e

Net Annual Emissions Increase = (38,346 – 11,620) / (2044 – 2011) = 810 MTCO₂e

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable Air Quality Plan. The proposed landfill operational changes and additional power generation plant are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an

air quality plan conflict. Therefore, the project's potential to impact air quality is considered less than significant.

- b. See (a) above. There are no projected or existing air quality violations in this area that this proposal would contribute to. The project would not result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards.
- c. Construction related emissions are generally short-term in duration, but may still cause adverse air quality impacts. According to the BAAQMD Guidelines, fine particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) is the pollutant of greatest concern with respect to construction activities. PM emissions can result from grading, excavation, and vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces, and vehicle and equipment exhaust. Construction related emissions can cause substantial increases in localized concentrations of PM, and lead to adverse health effects and nuisance concerns. The BAAQMD has identified the following Best Management Practices which are now employed at construction sites throughout the Air Basin as a set of feasible PM control measures and which are incorporated into the project applicant's proposed construction activities to reduce any potential impact to levels of less than significance. They include:
 - a. Apply water to all active construction areas at least twice daily;
 - b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials *or* require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
 - c. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites;
 - d. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites; and,
 - e. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

By adhering to these Best Management Practices, construction activities will have a less than significant impact. Further, with low traffic volumes, the temporary nature of construction activities, and adherence to the Best Management Practices, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment Ozone [O₃] and Particulate Matter [PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}] under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard as indicated on the BAAQMD Website (http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm). Therefore, this project will not have a cumulative air quality impact.

- d. The project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or create objectionable dust or odors affecting a substantial number of people. The BAAQMD defines exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants and risk of accidental releases of acutely hazardous materials (AHMs) as potential adverse environmental impacts. Examples of sensitive receptors include schools, hospitals, convalescent facilities and residential areas with children. There are no sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. The closest offsite residence is approximately 165 feet away. Best Management practices incorporated into the project construction activities as described in (c.) above will serve to limit any potential for impacts from pollutants, dust or odors to a less than significant level.

The attached Air Permitting Specialists, *Analysis of Air Quality and Public Health Risks, Clover Flat Resource Recovery Project, Final Report, July 15, 2010*, focused on two main issues: 1) Air quality impacts associated with traffic in terms of daily and annual emissions, and 2) An estimate of public health risks in terms of residential cancer risk. These air quality impacts are associated with mobile sources (i.e., trucks and employee vehicles) and toxic air contaminants (TACs) related with in-vessel food waste composting, the landfill gas-to-energy recovery system and proposed wood-chip gasification and combustion power generator. The significance of these impacts are determined by comparing them with thresholds established by the BAAQMD based upon daily and annual emission rates of certain air pollutants and in terms of acceptable risk to the public.

The study assumed CFL traffic consists of light-duty employee vehicles, heavy- and medium-duty landfill and construction and demolition vehicles and heavy-duty recycling material trucks. The study concluded that peak daily emissions vary between 0.27 to 9.5 lbs/day. Average annual emissions varied between 0.03 to 1.02 tons/year depending on the pollutant. These levels are significantly below BAAQMD 80 lbs/day thresholds of significance. Neither the landfill nor mobile sources are significant sources of sulfur dioxide since diesel fuel and gasoline contain only trace amounts of sulfur. Landfill gas contains sulfur compounds, mostly consisting of hydrogen sulfide, but the on-site gas recovery system captures 75% of the gas that is converted to energy or destroyed by flare.

The risk analysis identified and quantified emission rates of TACs and their concentration in the vicinity of the project. Concurrent exposure and dispersion modeling analyses reviewed exposure pathways and cancer risk calculations. The main source of TACs is landfill gas that migrates off-site due to local winds. The 25% balance of landfill gas sulfur compounds not captured above is assumed to migrate off-site and transferred to nearby homes or businesses. Operation of the new power generation equipment would also release trace amounts of TACs but in quantities of one to two orders of magnitude lower than emissions associated with exposure to raw, untreated landfill gas. These sources of risk were not included in the risk analysis since their contribution to overall risk was minimal. Even with the extended life span of the CFL, the results indicate the lifetime cancer risk at off-site homes associated with exposure to TACs is estimated between one to two cancers/million based on the peak landfill gas generation in 2047. If emissions were averaged over 70 years, the average landfill generation rate and TAC emissions would fall below the peak level with correspondingly lower health risk. Therefore, the project's potential to impact air quality is considered less than significant.

- e. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. Earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction may cause a minimal temporary degradation of air quality from dust and heavy equipment air emissions during the construction phase of the project. Construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-run. This impact would be less than significant with dust control measures specified in the standard conditions of approval as described in (c.) above. Ongoing outdoor and proposed in-vessel composting will continue; feedstocks, finished compost and other processing materials are and will continue to be covered with tarpaulins except when materials are mixed or processed. In addition, finished compost is used as an effective bio-filter to control ammonia gases and occasional compost leachate. The application of exterior building finishes, paint, adhesives, may result in potentially objectionable odors. However, these odors are considered a less than significant impact due to their temporary nature.

Potential sources of odors associated with existing landfill uses, including outdoor and in-vessel composting, are already located at the site. This project will not create additional odors inconsistent with the surrounding agricultural setting. Incorporation of Best Management Practices into the project construction activities as described in (c.) above will reduce potential objectionable odors to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure(s):

- 2) All CFL food waste and green waste composting operations shall incorporate biofilters and other controls to reduce criteria pollutants and comply with BAAQMD Authority to Construct permit requirements.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The attached Questa Engineering Corp. (in association with Bruce Hagen and Jane Valerius Consulting), *Plant Wildlife and Tree Survey Reports for CFL Recycling Facility Expansion, July 14, 2010*, identifies the following special status species that are known to be in the vicinity of the project site:

Special Status Wildlife Potentially Present at the Clover Flat Landfill Site

Scientific Name	Common Name	Fed/State Status	Preferred Habitat	Likelihood of Occurrence in the Project Area
Invertebrates				

<i>Syncaris pacifica</i>	California Freshwater Shrimp	FE/SE	Low-gradient and low- elevation smaller streams with moderate to heavy riparian cover in shallow pools away from main streamflow.	None: no aquatic habitat is present at the project site.
Vertebrates				
Fishes				
<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</i>	Steelhead - Central California Coast ESU	FT/--	Anadromous - Pacific Ocean to streams and rivers	None: no aquatic habitat present
Reptiles				
<i>Actinemys marmorata marmorata</i>	Northwestern Pond Turtle	SC/SSC/--	Inhabits a variety of habitats with permanent or nearly permanent water. Requires basking sites.	None. Suitable habitat not present in the project area.
Birds				
<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>	American Peregrine Falcon	delistedFE/delisted SE	Near wetlands, lakes, rivers or other water. Nests on cliffs	Unlikely to nest on site. Known to nest in Dutch Henry Canyon adjacent to the project site and at Table Rock within several miles of the project site (Berner et al 2003).
<i>Accipiter striatus</i>	Sharp-shinned Hawk	None/None	Prefers forests of Ponderosa pine, black oak, riparian deciduous, mixed conifer and Jeffery pine. Nests near water.	Unlikely to nest - habitat suboptimal
<i>Accipiter cooperii</i>	Cooper's Hawk	None/SSC	Prefers riparian and oak habitats, but will use a variety of habitats near water.	Potentially present. Known to nest over 2mi to the south. "Possibly" nest in the project area (Berner et al 2003).
<i>Asio otus</i>	Long-eared Owl	None/SSC	Prefers riparian areas with adjacent open habitats	Not known to nest in the area (Berner et al 2003).
Mammals				
<i>Myotis thysanodes</i>	Fringed Myotis Bat	None/SSC	Optimal habitats are pinyon-juniper, valley foothill hardwood, and hardwood conifer forests. Uses caves,mines, buildings, or crevices for maternity colonies and roosts.	Unlikely to be present. Habitat not present.
<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	Pallid Bat	None/None	Deserts, grasslands, shrublands, woodlands and forests. Mostly common in open, dry habitats with rocky areas for roosting.	Unlikely to be present - habitat not present

Legal Status Definitions: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS):
FE - Federal Endangered
FT - Federal Threatened

California Department of Fish and Game (CDF):
SE - State Endangered
SSC - Species of Special Concern

However, the report states that only one bird species, the Cooper's Hawk, has the potential to nest in the project area. The other species are not likely to nest on the site because of their specialized habitat requirements are not present. The report concluded that, based upon the wildlife field survey conducted on May 4, 2010, the landfill expansion project would generally result in minimal habitat destruction to wildlife species that inhabit the site.

The report stated that the loss of trees could result in significant impacts to nesting birds under protection of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). This federal regulation provides that it is unlawful, except as permitted by regulations, "to pursue, take or kill any migratory bird, or any art, nest or egg of any such bird . . ." [U.S. Code Title 16, Section 703 (16 USC 703)]. This prohibition includes both direct and indirect acts, although harassment and habitat modification are not included unless they result in direct loss of birds, nests or eggs. The current list of

species protected by the MBTA includes several hundred species and includes all native birds. The reconnaissance-level survey resulted in observation of a variety of birds, none on listed special-status species, but which are still protected under the MBTA. The consultants concluded that tree removal and construction disturbance during the nesting season could result in potential nest destruction or abandonment or mortality of young. Disturbance of nesting birds, including the Cooper's Hawk, is a potentially significant impact that can be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the following mitigation measures:

- 1) Any tree or shrub removal shall for the gateway operations expansion area shall occur outside of the avian nesting season. If removal of trees or shrubs occur, or construction begins between February 1 and August 31 [nesting season for passerine (perching) or non-passerine land birds], a nesting bird survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist within one week prior to removal or disturbance of potential nesting habitat such as trees or shrubs. During this survey, a qualified biologist shall inspect all potential nesting habitat in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas for nests; and
- 2) If a nest is not found, mitigation is not required. If a nest is found on-site, then all vegetation with active nests shall be flagged and an appropriate non-disturbance buffer zone shall be determined by the project biologist in consultation with California Department of Fish & Game (DFG), shall be submitted to the County for review and will depend on the species involved, site conditions and type of work to be conducted in the area. Typically, if active nests are found, construction activities shall not take place within 500 feet of the raptor nests and within 55-100 feet of other migratory birds until the young have fledged. A qualified biologist shall monitor active nests to determine when the young have fledged and are feeding on their own. The project biologist and DFG shall be consulted for clearance before construction activities resume in the vicinity.

As stated above in Section II. Agriculture and Forest Resources, the proposed gate operations area expansion from 1.0 to 2.1 acres includes cut-and-fill of 70,000 cubic yards of material to create a level bench in an area of steep, forested slopes. The tree survey report found that approximately 392 native trees and large tree-like shrubs over 6-inch dbh would be removed for the expansion. The proposed mitigation planting of replacement tree canopy species and understory species with additional wildlife elements will restore three, previously-disturbed landfill operation areas and conforms with these Biological Resources mitigation measures. Other, proposed landfill operational changes will occur in areas which are already disturbed by existing landfill improvements. With implementation of the above mitigation measures, the potential for the project to have a significant effect on special status species is less than significant.

- b. Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (red-legged frog, vernal pools, vegetation, and plant surveys/CNPS layers) identify no habitat that would support riparian or other sensitive communities within the project area. The proposed improvements will occur approximately 692 feet from the nearest blue-line stream to the east (a tributary of the Napa River) and more than 6,650 feet (1.26 mile) from the Napa River. Any potential impacts related to soil erosion are analyzed under **Hydrology and Water Quality**, below. Impacts on federally protected wetlands, riparian habitats, and other sensitive natural communities are less than significant
- c. The County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Vernal Pool, Sensitive Biotic, Known Fish Presence, DFG Natural Diversity Database layers) do not identify the presence of Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act on-site or within the vicinity of the project area and therefore no direct or indirect impact as a result of the project is expected to occur.
- d. See Subsection a., above.
- e. With proposed mitigation measures, the project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies or ordinances. With implementation of mitigation measures, the project is consistent with biological resource policies relative to the County General Plan and the County Conservation Regulations. The proposed project does not involve any work to take place within required stream setbacks per Chapter 18.108 of the Napa County Code. Effective replacement of tree canopy and understory species with additional wildlife elements according to above mitigation measures ensure the project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the subject project site therefore no impact will occur.

Mitigation Measure(s):

- 3) Any tree or shrub removal for the proposed gateway operations expansion area shall occur outside of the avian nesting season. If removal of trees or shrubs occur, or construction begins between February 1 and August 31 [nesting season for passerine (perching) or non-passerine land birds], a nesting bird survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist within one week prior to removal or disturbance of potential nesting habitat such as trees or shrubs. During this survey, a qualified biologist shall inspect all potential nesting habitat in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas for nests; and
- 4) If a nest is not found, mitigation is not required. If a nest is found on-site, then all vegetation with active nests shall be flagged and an appropriate non-disturbance buffer zone shall be determined by the project biologist in consultation with California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG), shall be submitted to the County for review and will depend on the species involved, site conditions and type of work to be conducted in the area. Typically, if active nests are found, construction activities shall not take place within 500 feet of the

raptor nests and within 55-100 feet of other migratory birds until the young have fledged. A qualified biologist shall monitor active nests to determine when the young have fledged and are feeding on their own. The project biologist and CDFG shall be consulted for clearance before construction activities resume in the vicinity

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-c. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological layers), no cultural resources are located within the project boundary. As part of the original May, 1990 EIR prepared for the CLF Landfill Expansion, on March 9, 1989, California Archaeological Consultants, Inc. conducted a cultural resources field survey of the entire landfill site and found no evidence of cultural resources within the project boundary. All proposed landfill operational changes, composting and new power generation activities will take place on already-disturbed areas except for the proposed gate operations expansion area.

Despite the results of the earlier field survey and updated Environmental Sensitivity Maps, if cultural resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project must cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with Napa County's standard conditions of approval as follows:

In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the Conservation, Development and Planning Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that he can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

- d. No archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or evidence of human remains have been identified on the property. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with Napa County's standard conditions of approval described in (e.) above, thus resulting in a less than significant impact.
- e. No formal cemeteries are known to exist within the project area and, as noted above, no significant evidence of historic and/or prehistoric Native American settlement was found in the project area. Public Resources Code §5097.98, Health and Safety Code §7050.5, and CEQA §15064.5(e) detail the procedures to follow in case of the accidental discovery of human remains, including requirements that work be stopped in the area, that the County Coroner be notified, and that the most likely descendants be identified and notified via the Native American Heritage Commission. Foreseeable project-specific impacts to human remains are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. According to Napa County Resource Maps (Alquist-Priolo Fault and Landslides overlays) the proposed project is not known to be located within any Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. The project site area has Very Low Liquefaction potential. There are no landslides or soil creep in the vicinity of the project site. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, this low profile structure will be constructed to California/International Building Code requirements and possesses a less than significant risk. Soils on the majority of the landfill site consists of Hambright rock-Outcrop complex (30%-75% slope), a very stony loam with unweathered bedrock.
 - i. There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed facility would result in a less than significant impact with regards to the rupturing of a known fault.
 - ii. All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the expanded gate operations and recycling area must comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the current California International Building Code which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii. Based on Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer), the project is located in an area of very low liquefaction. A soils report, prepared by a qualified Engineer, will be required as part of the grading permit submittal. The report will address the soil stability and will be used to design specific foundation systems and grading methods. The facility will be constructed to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the current California Building Code which will reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iv. The project site is located in the north central Napa Valley in a hilly area. Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) do not indicate the presence of landslides on the property or specifically in the project area.
- b. Based upon the EMCON, *Geotechnical Analysis for Master Plan and Module 2 Supplement, CFL, Napa County CA, September 30, 1996 and November 8, 1996*, the site is underlain by Sonoma Volcanics covered with a thin layer of soils (less than 10 feet depth). The upper layer of the Sonoma Volcanics is the St. Helena Rhyolite comprised of welded tuff, pumice, lava and ashflows and breccias. The overlying soil is colluvium, alluvium and shallow landslide deposits generally consisting of gravel and cobble-sized bedrock fragments in a sandy clay mix. The internal shear strength of the bedrock was given a cohesion of 1,500 pounds per square foot and an internal friction angle of 30 degrees. Permeability is moderately slow due to its location in areas where the water table is high. Runoff is very slow with little or no erosion hazard. This background report is part of the CFL's Joint Technical Document which guides design and development of the landfill site.

The proposed project will be required as a condition of approval, to submit a site development plan, including implementation of pre- and post-construction stormwater and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance and Post-construction Runoff Management Requirements which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable, to ensure that development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways. Inclusion of these measures ensures that project will have a less than significant impact with regard to soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

- c. - d. Based on Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Mapping (Liquefaction layer) the project site has very low susceptibility to liquefaction. An updated soils report, prepared by a qualified Engineer, will be required as part of the grading permit submittal. The report will address the soil stability, expansive soils and potential for liquefaction and will be used to design specific foundation systems and grading methods. The expanded gate operations area will be constructed to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the current California International Building Code which would reduce any potential impacts, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse or the project becoming unstable to a less than significant level. This rocky loam soil is not considered to be expansive as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997). However, as required by State law, the applicant will be required to provide structurally engineered building plans consistent with an accompanying soils report that meet the requirements of the Napa County Building department and the current California Building Code thus reducing substantial risks to life or property to a less than significant level.
- e. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed this application and recommends approval subject to certain conditions of approval. The approval recommendation is based on the site evaluation performed by R.E.B. Engineering, Inc. submitted on March 22, 2011. The Site Evaluation Report and follow-up wastewater feasibility report found that there is sufficient area on the property for a wastewater system according to Napa County Standards, to meet proposed employee/customer uses in the new gate operations area. A geoflow subsurface drip system, along with a single Orenco AX20 pod aerobic treatment unit, was recommended for use due to ground slopes in the range of 30% to 40% at the recommended system location. Adequate space for a minimum 400 square feet drip system with 200% reserve area is available and is capable of adequately supporting the wastewater flow generated at the new gate operations area. Since the permeability of the soils has been determined to be adequate using the above described system, the risk of septic failure due to utilizing soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. - b. The proposed project will not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally found during normal landfill operations. As a Class III municipal solid waste facility, designated, hazardous and medical wastes cannot be accepted at the facility. If found, established procedures in the CFL Joint Technical Document define handling (including emergency procedures) and off-site transfer of designated, hazardous, and medical waste materials to an approved Class I or Class II waste-management facility.

The CFL also maintains a separate, stand-alone Hazardous Materials Business Plan that must be filed by the applicant within 30 days of any hazardous material reaching reportable levels. Part of the plan includes a Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) - Related Business Activity Form disclosing the types and amounts of hazardous material the applicant intends to store on the project site. These hazardous materials can include equipment-related liquids such as fuel, solvents, and lubricants. This plan is required by the Department of Environmental Management to be submitted for review, approval, and future monitoring. However, in the event that a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons liquid or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment will be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to establishment of the use. Said documentation and monitoring reduces the potential environmental impact to a less than significant level. The proposed project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or subject to the requirements of the County's Airport Compatibility Combination zoning district and the requirements of the *Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. Landfills are not allowed land uses within airport influence zones due to aircraft hazards created by birds attracted to these facilities. The proposed gate operations area expansion, additional power generation equipment and landfill closure date extension is not expected to cause a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area thus resulting in a less than significant impact.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports therefore no impact will result.
- g. The Napa County Fire Department and Public Works Department have reviewed the project design for compliance with emergency standards and have included conditions requiring the applicant to design the project for adequate emergency access and install the required equipment necessary to meet emergency response and evacuation. In addition, all access driveways proposed to serve the project will be designed to comply with County Fire and Public Works road standards so that emergency response requirements for ingress and egress to the project site are met. Compliance with these conditions will ensure the project will not have a negative impact on or hinder emergency response.
- h. According to Napa Resource Maps (Fire Hazard Severity overlay), the subject parcel is located in a designated high fire hazard area and is not located in the wildland-urban interface. With compliance with County Fire Marshal requirements for adequate emergency vehicle access and water storage facilities, the project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

*Clover Flat Landfill / Resource Recovery Park
Use Permit # P09-00511-MOD*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The site has a 10 gallons per minute (GPM) private well with 10,000 gallon storage capacity that will serve the existing landfill site. Wells serving potable water must meet all County and State water purity standards. The County shall require all proposed water systems to be in place prior to issuance of building permits for grading and gate operations area expansion. On-going monitoring and reporting is required to ensure no violations occur.

The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed this application and recommends approval subject to certain conditions of approval. The approval recommendation is based on the site evaluation performed by R.E.B. Engineering, Inc. submitted on March 22, 2011. The Site Evaluation Report and follow-up wastewater feasibility report found that there is sufficient area on the property for a wastewater system according to Napa County Standards, to meet proposed employee/customer uses in the new gate operations area. A geoflow subsurface drip system, along with a single Orenco AX20 pod aerobic treatment unit, was recommended for use due to ground slopes in the range of 30% to 40% at the recommended system location. Adequate space for a minimum 400 square foot drip system with 200% reserve area is available and is capable of adequately supporting the wastewater flow generated at the new gate operations area. Since the

permeability of the soils has been determined to be adequate using the above described system, the risk of septic failure due to utilizing soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems is less than significant.

The proposed project is a Standard Project requiring a construction related Storm Water Pollution Prevention Permit (SWPPP) from the Napa County Public Works Department that delineates pre and post construction activities. An approved grading permit, issued by Napa County Public Works, is also required. The Storm Water Permit and Grading permit will provide for adequate on site containment of runoff during storm events including erosion control measures such as placement of siltation devices and implementation of Best Management Practices throughout the development area. Therefore, with the inclusion of the above mentioned State and County permit requirements and incorporation of department comments as conditions of approval, the project will not have the potential to significantly impact any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- b. The project would not result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere with the recharge of groundwater supplies. Currently, water is supplied by an existing on-site well. The applicant has prepared a Phase One Water Availability Analysis for the current and projected water use for the proposed project. Based on the report, the total current water demand is 1.8 million gallons a year (\pm 5.52 acre feet per year) for existing landfill operations, a rate that is expected to remain unchanged given the fixed wastestream amount allowed at the CFL.

The County's allowable water allotment is based on parcel location. The project is located in a Mountain Area, outside the County's Valley Floor area, which has an established acceptable water extraction volume of 0.5 acre feet per acre per year. The project parcel is 179.97 acres resulting in a threshold for the property of 89.98 acre feet per year.

The proposed water demand represents no net increase to existing groundwater extraction for the existing landfill site. The Public Works has commented the proposed project would not have a significant impact on groundwater supplies or static water levels neighboring wells because the resulting water demand totaling 5.52 acre feet per year is well below the established County water allotment of 89.98 acre feet per year and would therefore be a less than significant impact.

- c - d. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Proposed improvements will occur approximately 692 feet from the nearest blue-line stream to the east (a tributary of the Napa River) and more than 6,650 feet (1.26 mile) from the Napa River. No work in or around these areas is proposed. While an approximately 1.1 acre net increase in overall impervious surface area will result from the gate operations area expansion, the project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage on-site surface drainage and erosion during construction and winter months (October to April). Best Management Practices will be employed to eliminate the potential for soil erosion during pre- and post-construction activities, alteration of drainage patterns or any increase in erosion or siltation on- or off-site is expected to be less than a significant. In addition, since the project is located in a large drainage basin, stormwater would be directed in a sheet flow action and be allowed to filtrate over a wider area. This type of runoff pattern would not generate a change to the drainage pattern or cause a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site resulting in a less than significant impact.
- e. The project is required to submit a site development plan as part of the grading and building permit applications, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Storm water Permit, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects. Since there will be more than one acre of disturbed area for the project, a pre and post Storm Water Pollutant Elimination permit (SWPP) will be required to minimize pollutant runoff from pre and post construction and agricultural activities. The Plan states new drainage swales will be installed to convey stormwater to existing drainage swales along the landfill access road from Silverado Trail. By implementing Best Management Practices through site design and source control, the project is not expected to create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff and thus result in a less than significant impact.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality. The Local Enforcement Agency oversees landfill operations and ensures compliance with Joint Technical Document operational guidelines which includes overall drainage control from composting operations and other landfill activities. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed this application and recommends approval subject to certain conditions of approval. The approval recommendation is based on the site evaluation performed by R.E.B. Engineering, Inc. submitted on March 22, 2011. The Site Evaluation Report and follow-up wastewater feasibility report found that there is sufficient area on the property for a wastewater system according to Napa County Standards, to meet proposed employee/customer uses in the new gate operations area. A geoflow subsurface drip system, along with a single Orenco AX20 pod aerobic treatment unit, was recommended for use due to ground slopes in the range of 30% to 40% at the recommended system location. Adequate space for a minimum 400 square feet drip system with 200% reserve area is available and is capable of adequately supporting the wastewater flow generated at the new gate operations area. Since the permeability of the soils has been determined to be adequate using the above described system, the risk of septic failure due to utilizing soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems is less than significant.

The Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the wastewater feasibility report and found the proposed system adequate to meet the winery's wastewater needs as conditioned. No information has been submitted that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.

- g. - h. The subject parcel does not fall within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map and no new housing is proposed for this project; the project is not within a dam or levee inundation area as mapped on the Napa County Geographic Information System layers. No impact would result.
- i. - j. The project site is located in the hills of the east Napa Valley. It is more than 6,650 feet (1.26 mile) northeast of the Napa River, separated by intervening hills, and over 30 miles northeast of San Pablo Bay. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Dam Inundation Layer), the project site is located outside any dam inundation areas; it is highly unlikely a seiche and resulting mudflow would impact the project parcel. Impacts to the project due to global warming will have no effect on the project either because changes in the global sea level are estimated by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, seiche, mudflow or sea level rise. Finally, the Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning (Cuttings Wharf Quadrangle, California Geological Survey, July 31, 2009) produced by the California Emergency Management Agency, indicates any surge produced by a tsunami would dissipate well before any can reach the project site. While the map is to be used for evacuation planning purposes only, it is based on the best available scientific information for a maximum tsunami run-up event. Potential for inundation by tsunami is considered to be less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. - c. The project as proposed will not physically divide an established community. The established community on the east side of Silverado Trail is rooted in agriculture which the project will extend through its viticulture activities. The County has designated lands on the valley floor and elsewhere for agricultural development and, as proposed, the project is consistent with the AWOS (Agricultural Watershed and Open Space) General Plan designation of the *Napa County General Plan, 2008*. The property is zoned AW (Agricultural Watershed) District and which allows Sanitary Landfills and associated improvements subject to approval of a use permit and provided that all of the conditions set forth in the Napa County Zoning Ordinance are met. The project does not present a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan and zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect

General Plan Policy AG/LU-29 states that governmental uses and public utility uses shall be permitted in appropriate locations. Only those new governmental and public utility uses which specifically implement programs mandated by the stat and federal government shall be permitted in non-urban areas. On parcels which are designated Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space on the Napa County Land Use Map, governmental uses and public utility uses existing as of 1983 shall be allowed to continue to operate and to use the existing buildings and/or facilities but shall be allowed to expand the size and volume of business only for the purpose of modernizing the facilities and meeting additional demonstrated public needs to the extent permitted by law. In this case, the existing landfill has been in operation since 1963 at the same site. Proposed changes in operation will take place in already permitted areas except for an additional 1.1 acre area, the location dictated by site topography and location of the only available access road. Proposed operational changes to expand recycling activities will comply with regional goals to divert wastestreams from landfill disposal, reduce greenhouse gases and utilize a portion of the existing wastestream as a source for alternative power generation of one megawatt per day.

Alternative There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans adopted by the County; therefore, no impact.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.- b. Based on the recently adopted Napa County General Plan 2008 and the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps (Soil Type, Surficial Deposits Overlays) the proposed the project site does not contain any known mineral resources nor is it designated as a locally important mineral resources recovery site and therefore project would not result in impacts to mineral resources.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. - b. The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the project construction phase. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles and noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. Construction activities would generally occur during the period between 7:00 AM – 7:00 PM on weekdays - normal waking hours. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Noise Element of the General Plan (Chapter 11) and the Napa County Noise Ordinance (County Code Chapter 8.16) which establishes a limit of 60 dBA for general noise levels and 65 bBA for intermittent noises at various distances from the site.

The Sound Solutions Acoustical Consulting Services, *Expected Sound Levels Due to Electrical Generating Equipment Proposed for CFL, Napa County CA*, November 15, 2010 report concludes that the proposed wood-burning power generation equipment, a Genset with gas conditioner, will have a specified cumulative duration of 51dBA for 30 minutes which is below Napa County Noise Ordinance standards of 75 dBA for 30 minutes, assuming the equipment meets the following specification:

- 1) Any gas conditioner installed shall produce a sound level of no more than 85 dBA at a distance of one meter from any face of the unit;
- 2) Any microturbine installed shall be Model MT250 Ingersoll Rand;
- 3) Any genset installed shall be Model JGC 316 GS-L.L by General electric, completely enclosed in a steel container provided by the manufacturer. The container shall include sound attenuators along air intake and air outlet paths;
- 4) An exhaust silencer (not provided by the genset manufacturer) shall be added to the genset. The silencer shall provide an insertion loss of at least 30dBA at all significant frequency components of the exhaust sound, e.g., Critical Muffler by Nelson; and
- 5) With the container and exhaust silencer installed, the genset sound level in any direction around the container shall not exceed 65 dBA at a distance of 10 meters from the nearest container face.

A similar Phoenix Energy wood-burning generator in Merced County was quoted as producing 51-53 dBA at locations ten meters from the unit. Unenclosed, the unit had exhaust noise levels between 81.3-91.6 dBA at 50 feet. The proposed equipment at CFL will be completely enclosed.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in exposure of people to excessive noise impacts.

- c. - d. The project is proposed to be set back approximately 2,500 feet northeast from Silverado Trail, a public arterial road. The project site is located within a seclude valley separated by intervening hills. The closest neighbor is located approximately 2,450 feet from the project site. This neighbor could be subjected to a permanent increase in ambient noise produced from expanded day-to-day landfill operations. However, the anticipated level of noise to occur for the operation of the facility would be typical of existing ambient landfill operations since 1963. The expanded gate operations area will be located almost half-mile away separated by intervening hills above the Napa Valley floor.

Outdoor noise-producing activities associated with the use would generally occur from 9:00 AM – 4:00 Pm, Tuesday-Saturday and 9:00 AM - 3:00 PM on Sundays. The Napa County Code (Chapter 18.16) and standard conditions of approval address noise related issues including but not limited to prohibiting outdoor-amplified sound systems for any outdoor activity and requiring that mechanical equipment be kept indoors or inside acoustical enclosures. The design of the proposed project, together with adherence to the County Noise Ordinance, would ensure the proposed project would not result in substantial periodic or permanent increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

- e. The project site is not located within two miles of an airport; the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels that is considered compatible with aircraft operations.
- f. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, no impact.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. - c. The project includes modification of landfill operations, construction of an expanded gate operations area and installation of a new wood-burning power generation equipment. The proposed project would not result in the inducement of substantial population growth, either directly

or indirectly. No new homes or roads are proposed. The landfill currently employs 16 people which, according to the applicant, will eventually increase to 20 employees. The proposed number of employees may lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, based on the County's, *Baseline Data Report*, total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed the Association of Bay Area Governments' (ABAG) growth projections by some 15%. Since the County has a projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, the population growth associated with the project does not rise to a level of environmental significance. Additionally, the County has adopted a development impact fee to provide funds for constructing affordable housing. This fee is charged to all new non-residential development based on the gross square footage of building area multiplied by the applicable fee by type of use listed in Chapter 15.60.100, Table A. The fee is required to be paid prior to release of building permit resulting in a less than significant impact for population growth. The project will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. No housing or people will be displaced as a result of the proposed project

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. No new or altered government facilities that provide public services will constructed as a result of this project. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development in accordance with the Napa County Fire Marshal's conditions of approval for the project. The additional demand placed on existing services as a result of proposed changes to landfill operations would be marginal. There will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times as the property has good public road access and adequate area within the site to maneuver fire safety vehicles and equipment. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases and wine sales tax, will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. - b. This project proposes changes to landfill operations, gate operations area expansion and addition of power generation equipment. Visits to local neighborhood and regional parks by landfill customers would be minimal and would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that would have an adverse physical impact on the environment.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. - b. The project is located on a 179.97 acre parcel on the northeast side of Silverado Trail approximately 1.0 mile east of Dunaweal Lane. Silverado Trail is an arterial road along the east side of Napa Valley. There is an existing, southbound left-turn pocket at the landfill entrance with an extended driveway apron between Silverado Trail and the landfill entry gate. No changes to the landfill's existing 275 vehicle trips per day (VTD) permitted under the existing Use Permit # U-43889. These trips represent a small percentage of the vehicles per day along this portion of Silverado Trail.
- c. The proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d. No changes to the existing landfill access road from Silverado Trail is proposed. On-site circulation would comply with Napa County road standards and emergency vehicle access requirements. The existing access driveway has adequate sight distance for ingress and egress. Because the applicant complies with earlier conditions of approval for all road improvements, the project will not substantially increase traffic hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use resulting in a less than significant impact.

- e. The existing driveway from Silverado Trail, on-site circulation areas for the expanded gate operations area and landfill facility parking areas meet the Napa County Fire Marshal requirements for access to the site and structures for fire protection and as planned, are adequate for emergency access.
- f. The proposed project will create parking spaces (including ADA spaces) and loading area spaces on-site. Due to the dynamic nature of landfill operations, the location of on-site parking spaces will change over time. Space needs for materials drop-off, temporary storage, material separation and transfer affect onsite design. There are optional areas where additional vehicles can be parked, planning staff does not foresee any significant impacts associated with inadequate parking capacity.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant environmental impact due to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations.
- b. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed this application and recommends approval subject to certain conditions of approval. The approval recommendation is based on the site evaluation performed by R.E.B. Engineering, Inc. submitted on March 22, 2011. The Site Evaluation Report and follow-up wastewater feasibility report found that there is sufficient area on the property for a wastewater system according to Napa County Standards, to meet proposed employee/customer uses in the new gate operations area. A geoflow subsurface drip system, along with a single Orenco AX20 pod aerobic treatment unit, was recommended for use due to ground slopes in the range of 30% to 40% at the recommended system location. Adequate space for a minimum 400 square feet drip system with 200% reserve area is available and is capable of adequately supporting the wastewater flow generated at the new gate operations area. Since the permeability of the soils has been determined to be adequate using the above described system, the risk of septic failure due to utilizing soils

incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems is less than significant.

- c. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which lists Best Management Practices for erosion control would be required as part of the project by the Public Works Department. No new construction of storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would result from the project which could cause any significant environmental effects.
- d. As discussed at the **Hydrology and Water Quality** section above, this project will not result in an increase in groundwater usage but will remain below the established threshold for the parcel. The permit for the existing water system could not be issued unless all conditions of approval regarding State and local requirements as set forth by Napa County Environmental Management are met. This permit ensures sufficient water supplies will be available to serve the project from existing and new entitlements and resources resulting in a less than significant impact on utilities and service systems.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. The project expands the landfill's operational capacity and creates additional capacity to meet any outside project's demands by extending the closure date and lifetime of the facility. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The site has been previously developed with an existing landfill since 1963. Although the site does not contain any known listed plant or animal species, proposed oak woodland clearance to grade 70,000 cubic yards of material to expand the gate operations area from 1.1 acre to 2.1 acres could result in significant impacts to nesting birds under protection of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). With implementation of identified mitigation measures, the proposed project will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Wildlife corridors in the development area would be improved and the new construction would not have a significant impact on biologic resources.
- b. The proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts are discussed in their respective sections above.

- c. The proposed project would not result in any environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.