

#### 4. OTHER REQUIRED CEQA SECTIONS

##### A. GROWTH INDUCEMENT

Section 15126(g) of CEQA requires that environmental documents discuss whether a proposed project would induce direct (or indirect) population growth, economic development, or housing construction. If it is determined that a project is growth-inducing, secondary effects of that growth need to be considered in the analysis of the project. CEQA defines growth inducement to include projects which would remove obstacles to population growth. Thus, there is often a direct relationship between growth inducement and utilities and other municipal services such as hospitals, schools, and fire and police protection. Growth inducement can also be defined as an action that would encourage an increase in density of development in surrounding areas or encourage adjacent development. CEQA also states that growth should not be assumed to be beneficial, detrimental, or of little consequence to the environment.

The siting of a new landfill or the expansion of an existing facility does not introduce features that draw other developments into an area. The expansion of the Union Mine Disposal Site would not open new roads, require new sewer systems or extensions of infrastructures which would normally be associated with residential or commercial developments entering an undeveloped area. While landfills do not necessarily encourage growth, neither do they significantly discourage it, except perhaps in the immediate surrounding area. In addition, the disposal of solid waste is not typically constrained by the availability of local landfills. This is because solid municipal waste can be transported by truck, rail, or ship to distant areas by way of transfer stations. The construction of the leachate/septage treatment plant would not be directly growth-inducing because it would only accommodate the same volumes of septage that used to be disposed of at the site which is now sent out of the county for disposal. The development of the septage treatment facility would not allow an increase in the number of septic systems permitted or installed. The capacity of the treatment plant would not be in excess of the demands associated with projected growth, and would not provide a cause or opportunity for growth. The development of the leachate/septage treatment facility would require the extension of electric utility lines to the plant site from existing powerlines adjacent to the landfill property. This would not extend electric

power to a new area not currently provided with power, and would not be growth-inducing. The construction of wastewater pipelines to transport treated effluent to the Deer Springs Wastewater Treatment Plant would also not be directly growth-inducing because they would not provide disposal capability in excess of demands associated with established growth projections. Thus, it is concluded that the proposed expansion of the Union Mine Disposal Site and construction of ancillary facilities will neither directly restrict or induce growth.

B. EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Several environmental effects which would result from the development of the proposed project are considered not to be significant. These non-significant effects include: impacts to regional air quality; increases in noise; project related increases in traffic; affects to public health and safety; the area's public service system's availability; adequacy and ability to serve the site; land use interface effects; and impacts to the site's cultural resources.

C. BENEFICIAL IMPACTS

The proposed project, if implemented, would result in several beneficial effects for the county. The proposed project would provide the County of El Dorado with continued municipal solid waste disposal capacity for over 22 years. If the proposed project were not implemented, a 2 to 3 year refuse capacity shortfall may occur while the county tries to permit a new site. The development of a new landfill site would also be significantly more costly than the implementation of the proposed project.

Additionally, the proposed project would provide for the collection and treatment of leachate and contact water produced from the existing landfill. The collection and treatment of flows from the existing landfill would prevent their discharge to Martinez Creek, and would help reduce the potential for degradation of the creek.

The proposed project would also provide a place and the means for the construction of a septage treatment facility to treat septage wastes generated from throughout the county. A leachate treatment facility on or very near the landfill property is a necessary aspect of the proposed landfill expansion. The construction of a

combined leachate/septage treatment facility would provide both services at one site, limiting the environmental impacts resulting from the development of two facilities. The septage treatment plant could be built elsewhere, but the development of the proposed combined leachate/septage treatment facility at the landfill site would eliminate the environmental impacts associated with the construction of a separate septage treatment facility.

D. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Implementation of the proposed project would extend the duration of landfilling activities at the site, but would not alter the existing character of the site. In accordance with Section 15126(e) of CEQA, an analysis of the long-term and cumulative effects of the proposed project are discussed below.

Biological Resources. The proposed project would result in the loss of 21.0 acres of native and nonnative habitat. The impacts to sensitive habitat types will be mitigated through the designation of an offsite biological open space preserve.

Water Resources. The proposed project would result in long-term and cumulative impacts to hydrologic resources due to the existing landfill activities, proposed landfill activities, presence of mine shafts, alteration of natural drainage patterns, erosion potential, and water quality contamination. The effects can be reduced to below levels of significance through a number of proposed design, monitoring, control, and mitigation measures.

Geology and Soils. No significant long-term or cumulative impacts related to geotechnical issues would result from the proposed project, provided that all of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR are properly implemented.

Air Quality. Potential short-term and cumulative impacts to air quality would be generated by the small increases in traffic levels. These potential impacts are not considered to be significant due to their incremental nature. Potential long-term air quality impacts may occur if the proposed project necessitates the development of a landfill gas extraction system. The potential impacts of a gas extraction system are not expected to be significant if developed due to their incremental nature.

Traffic and Circulation. The proposed project would contribute (although incrementally) to a significant long-term cumulative impact to LOS at several intersections in the project site region. These impacts could be mitigated to levels below significance through the measures outlined in the EIR.

Hazardous Materials and Infectious Waste. Hazardous material monitoring programs at the proposed landfill expansion would mitigate potential impacts to levels below significance. The acceptance of small amounts of asbestos and infectious waste is not considered significant. Cumulative impacts resulting from the disposal of hazardous materials/infectious wastes includes impacts associated with past operations. The areas planned for closure and expansion will be monitored to detect releases of contaminants to the air and ground/surface water. Implementing the monitoring program and taking corrective action when a release is indicated would likely mitigate potential adverse effects associated with hazardous materials/infectious waste.

Health and Safety. It is anticipated that impacts to health and safety can be mitigated to below levels of significance through measures incorporated into the EIR and through proper operating procedures at the site.

Noise. No significant short or long-term noise impacts are expected to result from the proposed project.

Public Services. No significant short or long-term impacts to the area's public services are expected to result from the proposed project.

Aesthetics/Visual Quality. Potential long-term and cumulative impacts related to landform alteration/visual quality from the proposed project would result from the conversion of an undeveloped drainage to a municipal solid waste landfill, and the extended duration of landfill activities at the site. The development of the proposed expansion would result in significant impacts to natural landforms and offsite views from the construction of the refuse fill. The level of these impacts would be somewhat reduced after final closure of the landfill and the subsequent implementation of a revegetation program. Residual impacts would still be considered significant and unmitigable.

Land Use. The proposed project would not significantly change the character of the site and would have limited land use interface effects on the surrounding land uses. The only effect to surrounding land uses would be associated with the extended duration of active landfill activities at the site, as discussed under visual quality.

Cultural Resources. No prehistoric cultural resources were discovered on the project property, and no impacts to prehistoric resources are expected if identified mitigation measures are followed. Impacts resulting from the expansion activities to historic resources are considered to have been mitigated through field verification and documentation, as described in the Cultural Resources Technical Report.

E. ANY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the alteration of the canyon drainage area to the south of the existing fill area, and the development of a treatment plant. Adverse effects which cannot be avoided under the expansion development scenario include the loss of oak woodland habitat, permanent landform alteration and effects to visual quality, alteration of drainage patterns, reductions of air and water quality, effects to health and safety, and increased traffic (incremental). As described in Section 3 of this report, all of these effects, with the exception of landform alteration, are either not considered significant or can be mitigated to below levels of significance.

