

**SECTION 3**

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ES	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
1.	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1-1
	Introduction	1-1
	Setting and Location	1-4
	Purpose, Needs and Objectives	1-6
	California Integrated Waste Management Act	1-6
	Discretionary Actions Required	1-8
	Historical Discretionary Actions Required	1-9
	Site History and Historical Operations	1-9
2.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2-1
	A. Description of Existing Facilities	2-1
	B. Description of the Proposed Project	2-11
	1. Landfill Expansion	2-20
	2. Leachate/Septage Treatment Plant	2-56
	3. Landfill Closure	2-63
3.	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	3.A-1
	A. Biological Resources	3.A-1
	B. Water Resources	3.B-1
	C. Geology/Soils	3.C-1
	D. Air Quality	3.D-1
	E. Traffic and Circulation	3.E-1
	F. Hazardous Materials/Infectious Waste	3.F-1
	G. Human Health and Safety	3.G-1
	H. Noise	3.H-1
	I. Public Services	3.I-1
	J. Aesthetics/Visual Resources	3.J-1
	K. Land Use	3.K-1
	L. Cultural Resources	3.L-1

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
4.	OTHER REQUIRED CEQA SECTIONS	4-1
	A. Growth Inducement	4-1
	B. Effects Found Not to be Significant	4-2
	C. Beneficial Impacts	4-2
	D. The Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Long Term Productivity	4-3
	E. Any Significant Environmental Changes	4-5
5.	PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	5-1
	A. No Project Alternative	5-1
	B. Alternative Expansion/Configuration Design	5-2
	C. Alternative Location	5-8
	D. Waste Reduction and Alternative Technologies	5-14
6.	ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED	6-1
7.	REFERENCES CITED	7-1
8.	CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY AND QUALIFICATIONS	8-1

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1-1	General Site Location	1-2
1-2	Vicinity Map	1-3
1-3	Topographic Vicinity Map of Union Mine Disposal Site	1-5
1-4	Waste Management Areas of El Dorado County	1-7
<u>A</u>	<u>1964 Schematic Plan of Union Mine Disposal Site</u>	<u>1-10</u>
<u>B</u>	<u>Union Mine Disposal Site as Shown in 1978 Solid Waste Facilities Permit</u>	<u>1-11</u>
1-5	Site Features	1-14

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

### LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
2-1	Summary of Waste Stream Composition – West Slope Area of El Dorado County	2-5
2-2	Approximate Surface Water and Groundwater Sampling Locations	2-8
2-3a	Timeline of Expansion/Closure Activities	2-21
2-3b	Timeline of Expansion Closure Activities	2-22
2-4	Existing Landfill, Final and Partial Closure Contours	2-25
2-5	Final Closure Contours	2-27
2-6	Perspective View and Cross Section of a Typical Modern Landfill	2-29
2-7	Excavation Plan – Expansion Area	2-31
<u>C</u>	<u>Union Mine Disposal Site Showing Proposed Expansion Area with 1,000-foot Buffer and BLM Acreage Proposed to be Acquired</u>	<u>2-33</u>
<u>D</u>	<u>BLM Lands Subject to Rezone</u>	<u>2-35</u>
<u>E</u>	<u>Current Parcel Numbers and Land Use Designations Adjacent to the Union Mine Disposal Site</u>	<u>2-37</u>
2-8	Mine Opening Locations	2-39
2-9	Schematic Mine Tunnel Plug	2-40
2-10	Excavation and Fill Sequence Plan	2-41
2-11	Cover Soil Borrow Plan – Expansion Area	2-43
2-12	Expansion Area Liner Plan	2-45
2-13	Aerial Photograph and Schematic Location of Proposed Facilities	2-46
2-14	Surface and Ground Water Collection Plan	2-53
2-15	Expansion Area Cross-Section Showing Leachate Collection and Removal System	2-57
2-16	Leachate Collection System Layout	2-59
2-17	Union Mine Road Realignment	2-61
2-18	Schematic of Leachate/Septage Treatment Facility	2-64
3A-1	Vegetative Communities in the Project Area	3.A-3
3A-2	Habitats Within the Proposed Mitigation Area	3.A-21
3B-1	Surface Water and Ground Water Monitoring Locations	3.B-3
3B-2	Approximate Locations of Mine Working	3.B-5
3B-3	Ground Water Elevations Near the Union Mine Disposal Site	3.B-7

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

### LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
3B-4	Leachate Collection Facilities Plan	3.B-13
3B-5	Trilinear Diagram Plot of Water Analyses from the Union Mine Disposal Site	3.B-22
3B-6	Hydrogeochemical Classification System for Natural Waters Using the Trilinear Diagram	3.B-23
3C-1	Topographic Vicinity Map of Union Mine Disposal Site	3.C-2
3C-2	Regional Geologic Map	3.C-4
3C-3	Principal Soil Units of Union Mine Area	3.C-7
3C-4	Maximum Credible Rock Acceleration from Earthquakes in California	3.C-11
3E-1	Existing Roadways in the Vicinity of the Union Mine Disposal Site	3.E-2
3E-2	Existing Average Daily Traffic and P.M. Peak Hour Volumes	3.E-3
3E-3	Cumulative Average Daily Traffic and P.M. Peak Hour Volumes	3.E-8
3F-1	Hazardous Material Disposal Warning Sign at the Union Mine Disposal Site	3.F-12
3H-1	Noise Monitoring Locations	3.H-7
3J-1	Photograph of Union Mine Landfill Looking North from Gun Club	3.J-2
3J-2	View of Landfill Facilities Looking Northeast Toward Entrance	3.J-3
3J-3	Photograph of Landfill Support Facilities	3.J-5
3J-4	View of of Expansion Area Looking East	3.J-6
3J-5	Views of Proposed Treatment Plant Sites	3.J-7
3J-6	Views of the Union Mine Disposal Site	3.J-9
3J-7	Views of Active Working Face & Disposal Activities	3.J-11
3K-1	Land Use Designations of Landfill and Surrounding Area	3.K-5
3K-2	Zoning of Landfill and Surrounding Area	3.K-7
5-1	Option 2 Alternative Location	5-4
5-2	Typical Cross-Section of Option 2 Alternative Landfill Site	5-5
5-3	Option 3 Alternative Landfill Site	5-6
5-4	Typical Cross-Section of Option 3 Alternative Landfill Site	5-7
5-5	Photograph of Old El Dorado Hills Landfill Site	5-9
5-6	County Land Use Map for Area Surrounding Alternative Site	5-11

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

### LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
5-7	County Zoning Map for Area Surrounding Alternative Site	5-12
5-8	Class III Landfill Schedule & Flow Diagram	5-15

### LIST OF TABLES

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
2-1	Summary of Waste Composition Results	2-6
2-2	Estimated Site Capacity Assumptions – Union Mine Disposal Site	2-12
2-3	Landfill Life Calculations and Assumptions – Union Mine Disposal Site	2-13
2-4	Biological Treatment Design Data	2-63
3B-1	Aquifer Test Results – Union Mine Disposal Site	3.B-10
3B-2	Results of Water Sample Analyses – Union Mine Disposal Site	3.B-15
3B-3	Results of Water Sample Analyses – El Dorado County	3.B-16
3C-1	Properties of Soils Underlying Union Mine Landfill	3.C-8
3D-1	Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards	3.D-3
3D-2	Average Concentration of Compounds in Ambient Air and Landfill Gas at the El Dorado Landfill	3.D-6
3D-3	El Dorado Landfill Operational Combustion Criteria Pollutants	3.D-9
3E-1	Traffic Indices (TIs) for the Union Mine Landfill Expansion	3.E-7
3F-1	Summary of Waste Composite Results	3.F-3
3H-1	El Dorado County Noise Standards	3.H-3
3H-2	El Dorado County Standards for Acceptable Exterior Noise Exposure Levels for Residential Land Uses	3.H-4
3H-3	Measured Ambient Noise Levels (dBA)	3.H-6

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)**

**LIST OF APPENDICES  
(Bound Under Separate Cover)**

<b><u>LETTER</u></b>	<b><u>TITLE</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
A	Notice of Preparation Responses	A-1
B	Emergency Response Plan	B-1
C	Biological Resources Technical Report	C-1
D	Traffic and Circulation Technical Report	D-1
E	Noise Technical Appendix	E-1
F	Cultural Resources Technical Report	F-1
G	Slope Stability Technical Memorandum	G-1
<u>H</u>	<u>Hydrology and Hydraulic Calculations for Detention Basin and Union Mine Road Improvements</u>	<u>H-1</u>
<u>I</u>	<u>Union Mine Land Exchange: Environmental Assessment EA No. CA-018-92-8 and FONSI CACA 28162</u>	<u>I-1</u>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### A. INTRODUCTION

The proposed project evaluated in this EIR consists of the expansion and eventual closure of the Union Mine Disposal site, and the development of a leachate/septage treatment plant on the landfill property, which is located in the western portion of El Dorado County, California. The existing landfill is expected to reach capacity within 5 years. The proposed expansion would provide the county with additional disposal capacity for over 22 years. The proposed treatment plant would treat any leachate generated at the landfill plus approximately 5–7 trucks per day of septage brought to the site from throughout the county.

The environmental issues are discussed in Section 3 of this report, and include biological resources, water resources, geology/soils, air quality, traffic and circulation, hazardous materials/infectious waste, human health and safety, noise, public services, aesthetics/visual resources, land use, and cultural resources. Section 3 addresses each issue in detail, including a description of existing conditions, a discussion of associated potential impacts, and required and recommended mitigation measures to lessen identified significant impacts. Alternatives to the proposed project are discussed in Section 5, including the No Project alternative, alternative configuration/design, alternative location, and alternative waste management techniques.

### B. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

This section summarizes the impacts and mitigation measures associated with the proposed project.

#### Biological Resources

Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the overall loss of 21.0 acres of native and non-native habitat which is considered to be a significant impact. No impacts are expected to sensitive animal or plant species.



Mitigation. Mitigation measures outlined in the EIR, including project design mitigation, and the preservation of oak woodland and white alder forest habitat through acquisition of off site acreage for designation as habitat preserve will mitigate impacts to below levels of significance.

#### Water Resources

Impacts. The potential degradation of groundwater quality due to leachate migration from the existing landfill and the presence of numerous mine workings under the site are considered to be potentially significant impacts. Potential surface water impacts are not considered significant due to the facilities proposed drainage control plans.

Mitigation. The proposed groundwater monitoring program and associated contingency plans will mitigate potential groundwater impacts to below levels of significance.

#### Geology/Soils

Impacts. No impacts are expected due to topographic concerns, stratigraphy, seismicity, slope stability and the presence of underground mine workings. The potential for significant impacts exists due to erosion, expansive soils, reactive soils, which can all be mitigated through standard engineering and construction measures.

Mitigation. Use of standard construction and engineering measures, such as use of erosion control measures, excavation of unsuitable materials, soil additives, or corrosion resistant building materials will mitigate potential impacts to below levels of significance.

#### Air Quality

Impacts. Potential air quality impacts associated with the proposed project include dust generation, odors and gaseous emissions from the organic matter decay processes.

Mitigation. All potential impacts related to air quality could be reduced to below levels of significance through use of watering or other appropriate dust control measures, revegetation, proper operational procedures including use of sufficient cover and repairing cracks, fissures and settling and if necessary, by the construction of landfill gas collection facilities.

#### Traffic and Circulation

Impacts. No impacts to traffic and circulation are directly attributed to development of the proposed project.

Mitigation. The mitigation measures outlined in the EIR are those needed on a cumulative level, and are not required as part of the proposed project.

#### Hazardous Materials/Infectious Waste

Impacts. Asbestos disposal at the site is not expected to result in significant impacts due to the required disposal procedures and relative immobility of asbestos material. Hazardous waste impacts are expected to be adverse but not significant.

Mitigation. Mitigation to ensure the effects of hazardous/infectious waste and kept below significant levels includes minor modifications to the county's load screening program.

#### Human Health and Safety

Impacts. Impacts associated with vectors and pests, public exposure to hazardous/infectious wastes, and human health and safety due to contaminated water are not considered significant. Impacts associated with waste- and septage-hauling vehicles are considered insignificant. Impacts associated with gases buildup of landfill are also considered insignificant.

Mitigation. Mitigation measures proposed in the EIR Sections on Air Quality, Water Resources, Hazardous Materials and Traffic/Circulation are adequate to reduce health and safety impacts. However, it is recommended that vents for landfill gas be sited away from landfill traffic areas.

## Noise

Impacts. The landfill expansion would not increase onsite activities, nor would it increase the number of vehicle trips to the site. The noise associated landfill expansion would not be significantly different from existing conditions. No significant impacts are expected.

Mitigation. All impacts would be mitigated through compliance with county and EID noise standards.

## Public Services

Impacts. The proposed landfill expansion project is not expected to have significant impacts on the area's public services.

Mitigation. No mitigation measures are required.

## Aesthetics/Visual Resources

Impacts. The expansion of the landfill would result in significant, unmitigable impacts associated with landform alteration. Impacts associated with views of the site are considered significant until closure, and partially mitigable through revegetation measures. The impacts associated with visibility of the treatment plant and ancillary facilities is not considered significant.

Mitigation. Impacts associated with landform alteration are permanent and nonmitigable. Revegetation measures must be completed in a timely manner, and must be sufficiently planned and maintained.

## Land Use

Impacts. No significant land use impacts were identified either for the expansion project or the final closure of the site.

Mitigation. No significant impacts were identified, therefore no mitigation measures are required.

### Cultural Resources

Impacts. No prehistoric cultural resources were found within the projects site, and none are known to have been previously recorded. Impacts associated with destruction of historic resources (mines and associated facilities) are considered mitigated through the documentation contained in the cultural resources technical report prepared for the project.

Mitigation. No additional mitigation is required.