

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This summary is provided in accordance with the CEQA, including CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 (Title 14, CCR.) As stated in CCR Section 15123(a), “an environmental impact report (EIR) shall contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical.” As required by the CCR, this section includes: (1) a summary description of the proposed project; (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures; (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated and of the environmentally superior alternative; (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project; and (5) issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives.

2.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

2.2.1 Background

The Recology Hay Road (RHR) Landfill has been operating at the site since 1964. Recology is an integrated resource recovery company that currently owns and operates RHR Landfill. Facilities at the project site associated with landfill operations include monitoring and control systems (e.g., groundwater, landfill gas, leachate), storm water retention ponds, flood control berms, groundwater dewatering facilities, materials handling and processing areas, various structures, access roads, and a borrow pit. The landfill provides solid waste disposal services for both municipal and commercial customers in the San Francisco Bay Area and the Sacramento Valley, but primarily serves Solano County, including the cities of Vacaville and Dixon and portions of the unincorporated County. Under the current Conditional Use Permit (CUP) U-11-09/Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) 48-AA-0002, the 256-acre permitted landfill has a maximum allowable height limit of 215 feet above mean sea level (msl), a maximum limit for disposal depth of 20 feet below msl, and a total disposal design capacity of 37 million cubic yards (Solano County 2013). In 2016, the RHR Landfill had an average daily throughput of 1,682 tons per day (tpd). In 2017, fires in Sonoma County, an emergency condition, resulted in the need to accept fire debris at local landfills, including the RHR Landfill. As a result, annual throughput at the RHR Landfill increased to 1,947 tpd in response to the emergency condition. As of May 2018, 24.9 million cubic yards of disposal capacity was available for solid waste disposal (Golder 2018).

Included on top of the 256-acre permitted landfill is the Jepson Prairie Organics (JPO) Compost Facility. The permitted footprint of JPO is 39 acres (CalRecycle 2018). JPO is permitted to process manure, orchard and vineyard prunings, crop residue, post-consumer food waste, and yard waste; however, no biosolids are permitted for composting. The maximum annual composting capacity of the JPO facility is 172,600 cubic yards (CalRecycle 2018). JPO currently utilizes two types of composting processes: windrow and Aerated Static Piles (ASP). The windrow process is used for the composting of green waste by piling organic matter or biodegradable waste in long rows. The ASP system is used to compost food and green waste, and employs covers, fans, and several biofilters within different composting zones. Before 2009, JPO utilized the AgBag© vessel reactor system but switched methods due to lower VOC emissions associated with the ECS system (i.e., a reduction of approximately 50%) (Sullivan 2011). Facilities associated with JPO operations include a 22-acre engineered composting pad; leachate collection ditches and sumps, two leachate ponds (Pond A and B), leachate storage tanks, and storm water controls, various structures, and access roads (CVRWQCB 2016).

2.2.2 Project Objectives

The following project objectives have been identified for the proposed project addressed in this Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR):

- ▶ increase the RHR Landfill's disposal capacity by approximately 8.8 million cubic yards;
- ▶ maximize daily tonnage to the RHR Landfill, while providing at least 15 years of estimated disposal capacity at the RHR Landfill;
- ▶ extend the estimated RHR Landfill life by at least 5 years compared to future conditions under which the RHR Landfill's disposal capacity is not increased;
- ▶ extend the ability of JPO to compost Solano County organics by at least 4 years compared to future conditions under which the RHR Landfill's disposal capacity is not increased;
- ▶ correct the permitted RHR Landfill boundary to reflect existing conditions at the site;
- ▶ allow the RHR Landfill more flexibility in how it balances high-volume and low-volume days;
- ▶ achieve higher solid waste diversion at RHR with better sorting of construction and demolition materials;
- ▶ account for changing market conditions for recyclable commodities while avoiding disposal;
- ▶ allow for the continued disposal of friable asbestos in Solano County past the filling and closure of the existing permitted monofill (DM-1), projected to be 2021; and
- ▶ o provide adequate soil cover for the landfill and avoid the import of soil.

2.2.3 Project Overview

The project involves the amendments to the existing RHR Landfill CUP and other associated permits to allow for the following new/expanded landfill operations:

- ▶ A 24-acre lateral expansion of the landfill disposal area within existing landfill property to include an adjacent triangular area (Triangle). Currently, the Triangle is largely undeveloped open space with a private gravel road, a manmade drainage channel (drainage ditch), an aboveground stormwater pipeline, and infrastructure for groundwater monitoring and landfill gas and leachate management. Under the proposed project, this entire area would be included within the permitted landfill disposal area. The Triangle would result in an increase of approximately 8.8 million cubic yards to the landfill's disposal capacity with the landfill footprint extended to the south. Because the expansion area would provide additional disposal capacity, it would extend the landfill's overall life by at least 5 years. Because the JPO compost facility is within the permitted disposal footprint and will, in a later phase of the landfill, be decommissioned to allow for disposal of waste in this area, the proposed capacity increase associated with the lateral expansion of the landfill would also extend the potential life of JPO by at least 4 years.
- ▶ The permitted 39-acre JPO facility boundary would be reduced to approximately 38 acres. The 1-acre area to be removed from the JPO boundary is currently a setback area and would be operated under the RHR Landfill's SWFP instead of the JPO's Compostable Materials Handling Permit (CMHP).
- ▶ A CUP modification that acknowledges disposal module-1 (DM-1) extends 0.3-acre beyond its originally defined disposal footprint. The permitted disposal footprint would be adjusted to reconcile the newly understood disposal footprint.
- ▶ Temporary storage (i.e., maximum of six months) of baled, single-stream recyclables within the landfill footprint until processing capabilities are improved to meet the new requirements and/or new markets are developed to accept the material. Specifically, RHR is proposing four bale stockpiles near the existing administrative office of up to 3,680 bales total.

- ▶ Increase in the allowable tonnage received on a peak day to 3,400 tpd with a 7-day-average limit of 3,200 tpd of disposal. The inclusion of a peak tonnage and a 7-day-average limit would allow the facility to accept additional waste on peak days without having to divert haulers to other facilities while en-route.
- ▶ Installation and operation of a sorting, separation, and processing area for construction and demolition (C&D) materials. This would allow for greater recovery of recyclable materials and greater diversion of materials from landfill disposal. The footprint of the portable C&D sorting operation would be approximately 150 feet wide by 300 feet long and would include all equipment and stockpiled materials.
- ▶ As part of permit modifications and except for DM-2.1, friable asbestos disposal is proposed within all existing DMs. Currently, the landfill is permitted to receive up to 2,500 tons per month of friable asbestos with disposal of this material limited to DM-1. No modification of the monthly tonnage limit on friable asbestos disposal would occur; rather, the onsite location would change because DM-1 is expected to meet capacity and close by 2021.
- ▶ Deepening and widening the limits of the existing soil borrow pit to accommodate the increased need for soil associated with proposed landfill construction and operations. The existing borrow pit measures 80 acres with a current maximum excavation depth of 60 feet below ground surface (bgs). In anticipation of the need for approximately 3.6 million cubic yards of additional soil, up to a 6-acre increase in the existing footprint of the borrow pit and deepening of the borrow pit by an additional 68 feet bgs is proposed as part of the project.
- ▶ An additional enclosed landfill gas (LFG) flare would be installed adjacent to the existing flare to ensure a total capacity of 6,000 cfm at the landfill for safe and adequate control of LFG.

Refer to Chapter 3, "Project Description" for further information regarding each of the proposed amendments listed above.

2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 2-2, at the end of this chapter, summarizes the environmental impacts of the proposed project, the level of significance of the impact before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures for significant impacts, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of mitigation. Implementation of the project would result in a cumulatively considerable contributions to significant and unavoidable transportation impacts at the intersections of State Route (SR) 12/SR 113 and SR 113/Midway Road and along Midway Road, which are projected to operate at unacceptable levels under Cumulative No Project conditions.

2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

This Draft SEIR evaluates three alternatives to the proposed project: Alternative 1: No Project, Alternative 2: Vertical Expansion Alternative, and Alternative 3: Recology Ostrom Road Expansion.

Under Alternative 1: Under the No Project Alternative, no amendments to the existing RHR Landfill CUP and other permits would be made and current conditions would continue until the landfill reaches capacity. Once the site reaches capacity, the landfill would be closed in accordance with closure and monitoring procedures and groundwater and LFG would continue to be monitored. All structures unrelated to ongoing monitoring of the site would be removed.

Alternative 2: Vertical Expansion Alternative. Alternative 2 would involve an increase in the allowable height limit of the existing landfill as part of the amended CUP to the maximum feasible height (260 feet above ground surface) from a grading perspective (shown in Figure 6 1). A summary of the increased total disposal capacity and landfill life for Alternative 2 compared to the proposed project is shown in Table 6-1. This alternative would result in no lateral expansion of the landfill into the Triangle and no increase to existing tonnage limit of 2,400 tons per day (tpd). As a result, deepening and widening of the borrow pit and installation of an additional flare would not be required under this alternative. However, improvements to existing C&D operations, as well as temporary storage of recyclable bales

would occur under this alternative. While this alternative would result in an expansion in the overall solid waste disposal capacity of the landfill, the expansion would accommodate approximately 7,721,700 cy less than that of the proposed project. The smaller increase in disposal capacity under Alternative 2 would result in an estimated closure date extension of less than one year versus the five years that would likely occur under the proposed project.

Alternative 3: Under Alternative 3, expansion in disposal capacity would occur at the Recology Ostrom Road (ROR) Landfill instead of expanding disposal capacity at RHR Landfill. ROR is a Class II Landfill and the only other landfill owned and operated by Recology. Located in southern Yuba County (5900 Ostrom Rd, Wheatland, CA), the ROR Landfill is approximately 76 miles northeast of RHR Landfill and provides solid waste disposal services to both municipal and commercial customers in the northern Sacramento Valley including Yuba, Sutter, Butte, Nevada, and Colusa Counties. The facility has been in operation since 1995, and to date, approximately 70 acres out of a total landfill development of 225 acres has been constructed and approved for operation (CRWQCB 2018: 2). The facility's maximum permitted capacity is 43,467,231 cubic yards (CY) and maximum permitted throughput is 3,000 tons per day (CalRecycle 2007). With a remaining capacity of 24,395,000 tons as of June 2016, ROR Landfill is estimated to reach capacity by 2102 (CVRWQCB 2018:2). Expansion of an existing waste disposal facility would have fewer impacts than construction of a new site, and as discussed above, other offsite alternatives were determined to be infeasible. In order to meet long-term, regional solid waste disposal needs, the projected additional solid waste capacity necessary for RHR customers (i.e., 8.8 million cubic yards) would be provided at ROR Landfill for disposal instead of through the expansion of existing disposal capacity at RHR Landfill. Under this alternative, a similar lateral expansion of ROR Landfill would occur. Additionally, vehicles carrying solid waste coming from the Bay Area would travel an additional 152 miles per round trip to reach the ROR Landfill. Assuming that only transfer and packer trucks associated with the projected increase in vehicle trips under the proposed project would travel to the ROR Landfill instead of the RHR Landfill, up to 114 vehicles per day (refer to Table 4.11-6 of Section 4.11, 'Transportation') would travel the additional 152 miles, resulting in a net increase of 17,328 vehicle miles per day under this alternative, compared to the proposed project. However, no expansion of operations or potential increase in the number of vehicles travelling to and from the landfill per day would occur at the RHR Landfill under this alternative.

2.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 suggests that an EIR should identify the "environmentally superior" alternative. "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives."

The No Project Alternative would avoid the localized significant environmental impact associated with the proposed project and the other "build" alternatives. However, if the project or a similar expansion of RHR Landfill is not undertaken, an alternative location for solid waste disposal in the region would be necessary. As noted above, the RHR Landfill represents one of the closer regional landfills to the Bay Area. An alternative solid waste disposal location would likely be farther away, and require longer haul truck trips, which would result in a greater overall impact on air quality, GHG emissions, and transportation within the region. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not meet the need for long-term solid waste disposal capacity in Solano County and elsewhere in the region, would not minimize the net fiscal effects on rate payers and taxpayers, and would not conserve resources while providing a reasonable level of solid waste disposal. Therefore, this alternative would not realize the basic objectives of the project.

With regard to the other alternatives considered in this SEIR, development of Alternative 2 (Vertical Expansion Alternative) would reduce all of the potentially significant impacts of the project, primarily through less land disturbance. Alternative 3 would reduce localized impacts at the RHR Landfill but would have potentially greater impacts associated with haul trucks travelling further for disposal purposes and similar localized impacts at ROR Landfill. With respect to Alternative 2, it would avoid the considerable contribution to significant and unavoidable cumulative intersection and roadway segment operational impacts in the vicinity of the RHR Landfill associated with the project. With the exception of aesthetics, Alternative 2 would reduce impacts associated with all other resource areas compared to the proposed project. While Alternative 2 would involve an expansion of landfill capacity,

consistent with the project objectives, it would not achieve the project objectives related to increased gross disposal capacity and extension of the landfill's life to the extent of the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior within the near term but may result in greater long-term effects as a result of a lack of solid waste disposal options available to the Bay Area, similar to Alternative 3. Therefore, the environmental impact differences between the project and Alternative 2 are not substantial enough that one is clearly superior over the other. On balance, the environmentally superior alternative would be either the project or Alternative 2, depending on decisions weighing types of environmental benefits and adverse effects by Solano County.

2.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of a Draft SEIR to identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. The following provides a summary of issues raised through scoping and comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) that could be considered controversial. The comment letters received on the NOP's are included in Appendix A of this document.

- ▶ Odor
- ▶ Air Quality
- ▶ Water Quality
- ▶ Increase in truck trips to the landfill

Table 2-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures [Table 2-2 to be completed as part of Screencheck Draft EIR]

	Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable				
4.1	Aesthetics			
4.2	Air Quality			
4.3	Archaeological, Historic, and Tribal Cultural Resources			
4.4	Biological Resources			
4.5	Energy			
4.6	Geology, Soils, Mineral, and Paleontological Resources			
4.7	Greenhouse Gas Emissions			

Table 2-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures [Table 2-2 to be completed as part of Screencheck Draft EIR]

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable			
4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality			
4.10 Noise			
4.11 Transportation and Circulation			

For Document Production use. Please do not remove

File Contents

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY2-1

2.1 Introduction..... 2-1

2.2 Summary Description of the Proposed Project 2-1

2.3 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures 2-3

2.4 Summary of Alternatives..... 2-3

2.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative 2-4

2.6 Areas of Controversy..... 2-5

Appendices

Figures

No table of contents entries found.

Tables

Table 2-2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures [Table 2-2 to be competed as part of
Screencheck Draft EIR] 2-6

Acronyms/Abbreviations

Moved to TOC

Citations

Yellow = confusing (sequential lettering doesn't match, years don't match, misspellings, etc.)

Green = matched reference

Aqua = missing full reference

Pink = no citation in text

Solano County 2013

Golder 2018

CalRecycle 2018

Sullivan 2011

CVRWQCB 2016

References

Moved to ch