

### Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



Richard J. Bruckner Director

April 6, 2017

TO: Doug Smith, Chair David W. Louie, Vice Chair Laura Shell, Commissioner Elvin W. Moon, Commissioner Pat Modugno, Commissioner

| FROM: | Richard Claghorn             |
|-------|------------------------------|
|       | Zoning Permits North Section |

#### Project No. R2004-00559 Conditional Use Permit No. 200400042, Oak Tree Permit No. 201500007 RPC Meeting: April 19, 2017 - Agenda Item: 6

na

The above-mentioned item is a request for the approval of a conditional use permit ("CUP") and an oak tree permit to authorize the continued operation and expansion of a Class III landfill ("Project") within the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone, the Newhall Zoned District and the Castaic Area Community Standards District. The Commission held a hearing for the Project at Rancho Pico Junior High School in Stevenson Ranch on March 1, 2017, and this item was continued to April 19, 2017.

At the public hearing on March 1, Department of Regional Planning ("DRP") staff made a presentation on the Project. Staff described the applicant's request, which is to authorize the continued operation and expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill ("CCL"), A Class III landfill originally approved in 1965, and which was most recently approved by CUP 89-081 in 1997.

The applicant requested an increase to the daily maximum amount of solid waste that the landfill can accept from 6,000 tons per day to 12,000 tons per day and an increase to the weekly maximum amount of solid waste from 30,000 tons per week to 60,000 tons per week. The applicant requested that the landfill's total footprint be increased from 257 acres to 400 acres and that the maximum height of the landfill be raised from 1,430 feet to 1,573 feet. The request also includes relocating the entrance facilities to Wolcott Drive, adding a new household hazardous waste facility, a mixed organics composting facility, and future conversion technology facility. The applicant proposed to maintain the existing level of beneficial use materials that the landfill accepts. Beneficial use materials include uses accepted by the landfill which are not categorized as solid waste and which are put to a beneficial use, such as dirt, concrete, and green waste. The amount of beneficial use materials accepted in 2011, the year used as the baseline in the Environmental Impact report ("EIR"), was 2,358 tons per day.

It should be noted here that the EIR shows that in 2016, CCL accepted 1,417,668 tons of disposal material and 1,417,503 tons of beneficial use material, for a total of 2,835,171 tons of all materials.

This represented a substantial increase over previous years. Over a five-year period from 2011 to 2015 the highest year for total materials was 2011, with 2,066,138 tons, which included 1,330,310 tons of disposal material and 735,828 tons of beneficial use material. County records show that the daily, weekly, and annual waste disposal tonnage accepted at CCL in 2016, and in previous years, has remained within the tonnage limits established by CUP 89-081. Based on the 30,000 tons per week waste disposal limit of CUP 89-081, the maximum annual amount of waste disposal that could be allowed under the current CUP is 1,560,000 tons. CUP 89-081 did not establish a limit on beneficial use material.

Staff recommended approval to authorize the continued operation of the landfill, but with lower levels of solid waste and beneficial use materials than requested by the applicant. The recommended draft conditions would allow a maximum of 2.1 million tons per year of all materials, including 1.4 million tons of solid waste and 700,000 tons of beneficial use materials, including composting material. This compares with 4,030,416 tons per year of all materials in the applicant's proposal, including 3,120,000 tons of solid waste and 910,416 tons of beneficial use materials, including composting material. The recommended level of 2.1 million tons per year is based on the amount of material accepted by the landfill in 2011, the baseline year in the EIR. The reason for the recommendation of approval is that it will help to meet the future waste disposal capacity needs of the County, as outlined in the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, and as described in the Landfills policy section of the Land Use Element of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, and in the Los Angeles County General Plan Public Services and Facilities Element.

The Staff from the Department of Public Works ("DPW") also presented information about solid waste and landfills in the County, laws and regulations affecting landfills, the role of the Department of Public Works in solid waste management and graphs showing different possible scenarios of future solid waste management in Los Angeles County, including closure of CCL, continued operation of CCL, and other different assumptions on the future of solid waste management in the County. The scenarios showed that CCL will help to meet the County's solid waste capacity needs if it continues to operate, and that closure would contribute to a shortfall in waste disposal capacity within the County.

Staff's presentation was followed by a presentation by the applicant's representative, Mr. Mike Dean. Mr. Dean spoke about the landfill's operations, and stated that it does not have its own waste haulers, is neutral with all of its customers and does not have predatory pricing policies, in contrast to other area landfills. Mr. Dean stated that CCL accepted 2.9 million tons of all materials in 2016, a higher total than Sunshine Canyon Landfill for the year. Mr. Dean stated that CCL has received only one notice of violation for nuisance odors from the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD") in the past 10 years. In contrast, Mr. Dean said that Sunshine Canyon Landfill received 180 violations from SCAQMD over the past eight years. Mr. Dean expressed his objections to some of the draft conditions, in particular the fees and tonnage limits. Mr. Dean stated that CCL paid \$7.7 million in fees to the County in 2016, and he calculated that the fees for the same tonnage based on the new CUP conditions would increase to \$27.3 million. He also objected to the requirement to enclose the composting facility and stated that he would like the item to be continued to a later date so that the applicant would have more time to review the concerns with Staff.

Following the applicant's presentation, individuals who signed up to speak about the project were given the opportunity to do so. Each speaker was allowed up to two minutes to speak. A total of 67 speakers testified, including 29 in favor of the Project, 37 opposed to the Project, and one who expressed concerns but did not favor or oppose the Project. Due to the limited time available, 41 people who signed up to speak were unable to do so. Some of the concerns cited by landfill opponents were related to the following issues: traffic, air quality impacts, odors, water quality

#### PROJECT NO. R2004-00559-(5) CUP 200400042, OAK 201500007

impacts, property values, leakage of methane, public health impacts, alleged violation of a previous agreement with the community, environmental justice concerns, biological resource impacts, and availability of alternatives, notably Mesquite Canyon Landfill.

Due to the large number of people who signed up to speak who were unable to do so, and because the Commission had questions about the Project and wanted time to review the supplemental materials that had been submitted for the Project, the Commission approved a motion to continue the hearing on April 19, 2017. The Commission requested that Power Point presentations shown at the hearing and supplemental hearing information be posted on DRP's website. They also requested written comments to be submitted from those who signed up to speak but were unable to speak at the hearing and who will not be able to attend the continued hearing. The Commission directed the applicant to provide written rebuttals regarding the issues raised during the hearing.

The Commission also asked questions about the Project to be addressed by Staff. These questions include the following:

- What were the terms of the current CUP (CUP 89-081), and what comments and commitments were made or understood within that process?
- What were the circumstances leading to the Clean Hands Waiver and what were the conditions of the waiver?
- How much of the land (CCL Project Site) has been in continuous ownership of the applicant? Were any pieces of land acquired in a subsequent purchase for additional expansion? What was the expectation when such land was acquired?
- What impact might closure of Sunshine Canyon Landfill have? Where would its trash go? Where would the traffic go?
- Where are schools located in relation to the landfill (CCL) and what are the landfill's impacts on schools in the area?
- What is the County's policy with regard to zero waste goals? How do the County's zero waste goals compare to those of other jurisdictions?

Responses to the Commission's questions and a response concerning Mesquite Canyon Landfill are included in a Question and Answer summary included with this memorandum. Rebuttals addressing the questions, issues, and concerns raised during the hearing were prepared by the applicant and included as a part of this hearing package.

Since the March 1 hearing, further changes have been made to the draft Findings and Conditions of the CUP and also to the draft Implementation and Monitoring Program ("IMP"). The maximum height of the landfill in the updated conditions is 1,430 feet, the same level allowed under CUP 89-081. The maximum landfill capacity was also changed to 60 million tons based on further review of the updated site plan showing the limits of fill. The IMP provides additional requirements to complement the enforcement and monitoring programs for the Project. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") has also been developed for the Project to mitigate potential Project impacts identified in the EIR. With mitigation, Project impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels, except for Air Quality and for Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change after 2020.

The following are possible approval motions for the Project:

#### CEQA:

I MOVE THAT THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND CERTIFY THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ALONG WITH THE REQUIRED FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND ADOPT THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PROJECT PURSUANT TO STATE AND LOCAL CEQA GUIDELINES.

#### Entitlements:

I MOVE THAT THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NUMBER 200400042 AND OAK TREE PERMIT NUMBER 201500007 SUBJECT TO THE ATTACHED FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS AND THE RELATED IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM AND THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM.

Please find enclosed additional materials for the above referenced item. The new items include revised draft findings and conditions, revised IMP, updated landfill site plan, and additional written comments from the public regarding the Project and related correspondence.

If you need further information, please contact Richard Claghorn at (213) 974-6443 or rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov. Department office hours are Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. The Department is closed on Fridays.

SZD:RC 4/6/17

Enclosure(s): Questions & Answers from 3/1/17 hearing, applicant rebuttals from 3/1/17 hearing, correspondence, revised Draft Findings & Conditions, revised IMP, revised landfill site plan, MMRP

### Questions and Answers from 3/1/2017 Regional Planning Commission hearing for Chiguita Canyon Landfill (Project R2004-00559, CUP 200400042)

### What were the terms of the current CUP (CUP 89-081), and what comments and commitments were made by the County at the time?

CUP 89-081 had a daily limit of 6,000 tons per day of waste disposal (Condition # 9e), a weekly tonnage limit of 30,000 tons per week (Condition # 9d), and excluded clean soil used for daily cover and other purposes and beneficial use material from the net tonnage definition and limits (Condition # 9f). There were no limitations on the amount of clean soil used for daily cover or for beneficial use materials in CUP 89-081. Some other key conditions of CUP 89-081 prohibited liquid waste, hazardous waste and radioactive waste/material (Condition # 9a), allowed for 24 hour operations seven days per week (except refuse may not be accepted between 5:00 pm Saturday and 4:00 am Monday), and landfill closure was to occur when the maximum landfill capacity of 23 million tons was reached or November 24, 2019, whichever occurs first (Condition # 46). Condition # 9c stated that "Nothing in Condition 9b or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the landfill or to otherwise modify the conditions of this grant". CUP 89-081 was approved by the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) on 9/11/96 and was appealed to the Board of Supervisors (Board). The Board held hearings on 1/28/97 and 2/25/97 that were continued. The Board approved CUP 89-081 on 5/20/97. A complete copy of the Boardadopted CUP 89-081 findings, conditions and mitigation measures is included with the applicant's rebuttal #1, which is part of the hearing package.

### What agreements were made between the landfill operator and the community and what commitments were made and understood at the time of CUP 89-081 in 1997?

An agreement was signed on 2/21/97 and 2/24/97 by representatives for the previous landfill operator, Laidlaw Waste Systems (Laidlaw), Newhall Land and Farming Co. (NLFC), Val Verde Civic Association (VVCA), and Citizens Against Chiquita. This agreement included establishment of a community benefit fund to be reviewed and approved by the parties to the agreement. VVCA was designated to accept and spend the funds in accordance with the agreement. Funds were to be disbursed according to the payment schedule attached to the agreement. Laidlaw agreed to participate with the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and to forward notices and reports to CAC within five business days. VVCA agreed not to oppose any action to deny CUP 89-081 and to testify at the Board Hearing on 2/25/97 that their concerns were satisfied. The agreement was to be binding on successors in interest of Laidlaw and NLFC. It included a list of proposed modifications to CUP conditions and mitigation measures. Most of these proposed changes were integrated into the adopted CUP conditions, including CUP Condition #46 regarding closure of the landfill upon reaching 23 million tons capacity or by Nov. 24, 2019, whichever occurs first. The agreement also included requirements for the Community Benefits Funding Committee. A copy of the agreement is included with the applicant's rebuttal #1, which is part of the hearing package.

Many members of the community believed that the agreement between Laidlaw, VVCA, and the other parties would require the closure of the landfill as soon as the 23 million ton limit was reached or the date of Nov. 24, 2019 was reached, whichever occurred first, based on Condition #46 of CUP 89-081. However, CUP 89-081 also contains a condition (#9c) which specifically allows the landfill to apply for a new permit and to expand. The permittee did in fact apply for a permit to expand the landfill, the pending CUP 200400042. Los Angeles County was not a

party to the agreement in 1997 between the landfill operator and the other parties, and the County did not require automatic closure of the landfill upon the termination of CUP 89-081 if a new permit to expand the landfill was filed prior to the termination of the previous CUP.

### What were the circumstances leading to the Clean Hands Waiver (CHW) and what were the conditions of the waiver?

A letter dated November 19, 2015 was submitted by Chiquita Canyon Landfill ("CCL") to the Department of Regional Planning asking for a Clean Hands Waiver ("CHW") pursuant to Section 22.04.110 of the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. The reason for the request was that the applicant was concerned that the limit of 23 million tons in CUP 89-081 would be reached before the pending permit, CUP 200400042, could have a public hearing, and the landfill could be forced to close while the permit was still pending. The pending CUP was delayed in large part because the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") review process had taken longer than anticipated, and some chapters of the DEIR had to be recirculated.

The Director of Planning issued a CHW for the landfill on March 17, 2016. The CHW authorized the continued operation of CCL in the event that the total maximum tonnage capacity allowed by Condition 46 of the existing CUP was reached before the environmental review and public hearing process for a new CUP could be completed. CCL is operating currently pursuant to CUP 89-081, approved in 1997.

The Director determined that the CHW should be issued because interim continuation of CCL operation is consistent with the policies of the General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan and serves the public convenience and welfare. Closure of CCL during the processing of the current CUP application would result in hardships to waste haulers and local communities, including price increases. The Director found that avoiding the temporary closure of CCL would achieve important policy objectives. The interim continuation of CCL operations is consistent with General Plan Policy PS/F 5.1 because it maintains an efficient, safe and responsive waste management system that reduces waste while protecting the health and safety of the public. If CCL was forced to close during the processing of CUP 200400042, waste from these communities would need to be diverted to other landfills located further away, which would increase transportation distances, creating traffic and regional air quality impacts, increasing greenhouse gas emissions, and increasing costs that would be passed down to County residents. Overall, closure of CCL during the processing of CUP 200400042 would result in inefficiencies in the County's waste management system.

The CHW requires CCL to abide by the conditions of CUP 89-081, except that it can continue to operate in the event that it exceeds the maximum capacity stated in its current CUP, subject to the terms and limitations of the Waiver. Terms of the waiver include the following:

- CCL must be operated in compliance with all applicable provisions of the County Code, and with applicable State and federal laws and regulations
- Except with respect to the 23-million-ton maximum set forth in its current CUP, CCL must comply with all conditions of CUP 89-081, including but not limited to the daily and weekly net tonnage restrictions
- Waste disposal must take place only within the horizontal and vertical footprint (the waste disposal envelope with the maximum elevation of 1,430 feet) depicted in the existing CUP, and shall not exceed 29 million tons (the amount analyzed in the EIR for CUP 89-081)

- The CCL operator must cooperate fully and expeditiously with LADRP in the processing of the pending CUP application
- The CCL operator must provide LADRP with weekly reports detailing, to the satisfaction of the Director, the daily disposal rates within the preceding week, the total amount in tons of waste disposed within CCL, and the remaining capacity within the approved waste disposal envelope
- The CCL operator must cooperate with LADRP's Zoning Enforcement staff to address ongoing concerns related to the operation of CCL

The Waiver shall cease to be effective upon the earlier of the following: the withdrawal, approval or denial of the pending CUP application, July 31, 2017, or the Director's revocation of the Waiver.

CCL reached the 23 million ton capacity limit in June 2016. CCL has continued to operate within the terms of the CHW. A copy of the CHW is included with the applicant's rebuttal #2, which is part of the hearing package.

# How much of the land (CCL Project Site) has been in continuous ownership of the applicant? Were any pieces of land acquired in a subsequent purchase for additional expansion? What was the expectation when such land was acquired?

The property owned by the landfill operator ("Project Site") has increased from approximately 592 acres in size at the time of the approval of CUP 89-081 to approximately 639 acres today. When CUP 89-081 was approved in 1997 the landfill had an area of approximately 592 acres. On June 13, 2011, a Lot Line Adjustment (RLLA 201100006) was recorded which increased the landfill's overall parcel size from 591.61 acres to 622.43 acres. The increase occurred near the intersection of Wolcott Way and Highway 126 where the new entrance facilities are proposed and a small strip on the east side of the property. The strip on the east side is approximately 25 feet in width and 360 feet in length, for a total of approximately 9,000 square feet (0.2 acres). The small strip does not contain any new facilities or landfill expansion. The main adjustment area was approximately 30.6 acres in size, transferring the land from Newhall Land and Farming Company to Chiquita Canyon, LLC. The adjustment became effective with the recordation of deeds to relocate the lot lines. The area acquired in 2011 contains the area of the proposed new entrance facilities, office, Household Hazardous Waste Facility, and some storm drain basins. It does not include any of the area of the expanded landfill itself.

A second Lot Line Adjustment (RLLA 201300007) was recorded on February 18, 2014. This adjustment increased the area of the landfill property from 622.43 acres to 639.11 acres. It affected the northwest corner of the landfill property and an adjoining 40-acre parcel owned by the Sagun family. The Sagun parcel was reduced from 40.19 acres to 23.51 acres, as 16.68 acres was added to the landfill property. Approximately 2.3 acres of the proposed landfill expansion area falls within the area that was acquired in 2014. Over 98% of the proposed 143-acre landfill expansion would occur on land that was already owned by the landfill operator in 1997 when CUP 89-081 was approved.

The landfill operator has stated that the reason for the acquisition of the 16.68-acre portion of the Sagun parcel was to make the lot line match the Significant Ridgeline for purposes of resolving grading and drainage issues. The new lot line coincides with or is very close to the designated Significant Ridgeline. The new area acquired near Wolcott Way and Highway 126 was acquired with the intent to place the new entrance facilities there.

### What impact might closure of Sunshine Canyon Landfill have? Where would its trash go? Where would the traffic go?

Sunshine Canyon Landfill placed 2,338,681 tons of solid waste into its landfill in 2016, by far the largest total of any landfill in Los Angeles County, with CCL a distant second, with 1,417,668 tons of solid waste (for beneficial use materials, CCL received 1,417,503 tons, compared to only 42,083 tons for Sunshine Canyon Landfill in 2016). If such a large amount of disposal capacity were to become unavailable, it would likely significantly increase the amount of waste accepted at other landfills in the County, especially CCL. The amount of this excess solid waste that would go to CCL would depend on the future tonnage limits allowed in CCL's CUP. Due to the capacity limitations on in-County Class III landfills, most of the excess waste would undoubtedly be sent to landfills located outside of Los Angeles County, unless CCL's tonnage limit is approved as requested, but even then CCL would not be able to handle more than about 65% of the amount of waste disposal that goes to Sunshine Canyon. Closure of Sunshine Canyon landfill would lead to less overall traffic from trucks hauling trash in the area of Sunshine Canyon Landfill, but would be likely to increase traffic around CCL and other area landfills, and in the area of Interstate 5 between Sunshine Canyon Landfill and CCL. Truck trips would become significantly longer for most of the excess trash, as the average length of truck trips would increase, but it would be dispersed throughout the region. A traffic study would be necessary to determine the extent of the potential impacts from any potential closure of Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

The county has recognized Sunshine Canyon Landfill has operational issues relating to odor nuisance impacting the surrounding community. However, the landfill is fully permitted and operational and there are no pending enforcement activities to close it.

### Where are schools located in relation to the landfill (CCL) and what are the landfill's impacts on schools in the area?

According to the available information, there are 30 educational facilities within five miles of CCL. This number includes 10 existing public elementary schools, two proposed public elementary schools, three public middle schools, five public high schools, three early childhood education and Head Start facilities and seven private and charter schools. Four of the facilities are located less than a mile from CCL, including a Head Start facility located in Val Verde, two private or charter schools, and one proposed public elementary school. Two educational facilities are located from one to two miles of CCL, including one existing and one proposed public elementary school. Five facilities are located between two to three miles. Another seven of the facilities are between three and four miles away, and the remaining 12 are from four to five miles away. A map showing the locations of the educational facilities is included as part of the applicant's rebuttal #13. According to the Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project, which is discussed in depth in the EIR, the risk to human health is less than significant based on the criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District for measuring the potential health impacts, even for the nearest sensitive receptors.

### What is the County's policy with regard to zero waste goals? How do the County's zero waste goals compare to those of other jurisdictions?

The County Board of Supervisor has adopted a Roadmap to a Sustainable Waste Management Future plan for the County Unincorporated Areas. This Plan, together with other Zero-waste initiatives of Cities in the Los Angeles County, including The City of Los Angeles, served as the County's long-term guiding document to phase out Countywide reliance on landfills for disposal of municipal solid waste.

The Roadmap establishes milestones towards zero waste, with 80% diversion from landfills by 2025, 90% by 2035, and 95% or more by 2045.

This timeframe acknowledges the current lack of infrastructure and existing recycling markets as well as the time necessary to develop additional infrastructure.

The City of Los Angeles' Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan (SWIRP) is known at the City's Zero Waste Plan and the City also has a Program called Zero Waste LA – Franchise. The City's SWIRP has a goal to achieve landfill diversion of 90% or more by 2025

The City of San Francisco has adopted a policy goal to achieve zero waste by 2020. San Francisco defines zero waste as diversion from landfills and incinerators.

#### Why isn't Waste-by-Rail to Mesquite Regional Landfill used for waste disposal?

Ideally, it is preferable to have in-County landfill capacity, if feasible, for the following reasons:

- Los Angeles County should make every effort to handle the disposal of its own trash within its borders, if feasible.
- Waste-by-rail would be more expensive (cost could be doubled or more) which would impact the local economy.
- Exporting trash to out-of-County sites would have greater environmental impacts.
- Out-of-County disposal should be viewed as a means to supplement and extend the life of in-County capacity.
- According the Sanitation Districts, using the Mesquite Regional Landfill is currently not economically viable due to current market conditions.

#### DRAFT FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECT NO. R2004-00559-(5) CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 200400042 AND OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 201500007

- The Los Angeles County ("County") Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly-noticed public hearing on March 1, 2017, in the matter of Project No. R2004-00559-(5), Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200400042 and Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 201500007.
- 2. The permittee, Chiquita Canyon Landfill LLC ("Permittee"), is requesting the approval of CUP No. 200400042 for continued operation and expansion of a Class III Landfill ("Project") located at 29201 Henry Mayo Drive ("Project Site"), in the unincorporated community of Castaic, in the A-2-2 (Heavy Agricultural, Two-Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) and A-2-5 (Heavy Agricultural, Five-Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) Zones. A CUP is required in the A-2 Zone for land reclamation projects, pursuant to Section 22.24.150 of the Los Angeles County ("County") Code.
- 3. The permittee is requesting the approval of OTP No. 201500007 for the removal of four oak trees related to the landfill operation and expansion within the A-2-2 and A-2-5 Zones pursuant to County Code Section 22.56.2060.
- 4. The Project request includes the following elements: lateral expansion of the existing waste footprint from 257 acres to 400 acres; increased maximum elevation from 1,430 feet to 1,573 feet; increased daily disposal limits from 6,000 tons per day of waste to 12,000 tons per day; new entrance and support facilities; development of a household hazardous waste facility; mixed organics processing/composting operation; set-aside of land for a potential future conversion technology facility; acceptance of all nonhazardous wastes permitted at a Class III solid waste disposal landfill, exclusive of sludge; continued operation of the landfill and landfill gas-to-energy facility; new design features; and environmental monitoring. In addition, the Project includes the relocation of a portion of Southern California Edison's existing Saugus-Elizabeth Lake-Fillmore 66 kilovolt (kV) Subtransmission Line in order to accommodate landfill improvements.
- 5. OTP 201500007 is needed for the removal of four oak trees in the vicinity of the entrance facilities, which are being modified to improve traffic flow and increase efficiency. They include three Coast Live Oaks (*Quercus agrifolia*) and one Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*). The removals are related to the new entrance facilities, landfill expansion, and related grading.
- 6. The Project Site is an approximately 639-acre site, and includes Assessor's Parcel Number ("APN") 3271-002-011, 3271-002-013, 3271-002-019, 3271-002-036, 3271-002-039, and 3271-005-034. The Project Site contains the existing landfill operations

and landfill gas-to-energy facility. The Project Site is irregular in shape. Most of the site is mountainous, with elevations ranging from approximately 950 feet above sea level near the south property line to a high of approximately 1,640 feet near the north property line. The Project Site fronts on Henry Mayo Drive, State Highway 126, on the south side. The intersection of Wolcott Way and Henry Mayo Drive forms the southeast corner of the Project Site.

- 7. The Project Site is located in the Newhall Zoned District and is zoned A-2-2 and A-2-5. APNs 3271-002-036 and 3271-002-039, which include approximately 308 acres of the Project Site, are in the A-2-5 Zone. The remainder of the Project Site is in the A-2-2 Zone, which includes APNs 3271-002-011, 3271-002-013, 3271-002-019 and 3271-005-034. These zones are divided by a diagonal line running from northeast to southwest, with the A-2-5 Zone located to the south and east of this line and A-2-2 Zone located to the north and west.
- 8. The Project Site is located within the Castaic Area Community Standards District ("CSD"). The CSD contains restrictions on development within 50 feet of primary significant ridgelines and within 25 feet of secondary significant ridgelines. No grading or development is proposed within the protected areas of any significant ridgelines. The project is consistent with the development standards of the CSD.
- 9. The Project Site is located within the Community Serving (P-CS) land use category of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan ("Area Plan") Land Use Policy Map.
- 10. Surrounding Zoning within a 500-foot radius includes:

| turing-Development Program),<br>Zone-Development Program) |
|---|
| ial Retail/Office, Medium                                 |
|   |
| cturing),   |
| Park and Open Area land use                               |
|   |

- 11. Surrounding land uses within a 500-foot radius include:
  - North: Vacant land, water tanks, light industrial uses
  - South: Vacant land, agriculture uses
  - East: Vacant land, Post Office distribution center, water tank
  - West: Vacant land, single-family residence
- 12. The Project Site is currently accessible via Henry Mayo Drive to the south. Proposed new access will be from Wolcott Way at the southeast part of the lot where Wolcott Way intersects with Franklin Parkway. The new entrance facilities would be approximately 500 feet north of Henry Mayo Drive.
- 13. The Project Site was zoned A-2-2 and A-2-5 by Ordinance No. 7486, effective April 3, 1959. A portion of the south part of the Project Site corresponding to the current

boundaries of APN 3271-002-036 and a small part of APN 3271-002-039 was changed to the M-1.5 Zone by Ordinance 91022, effective October 17, 1991. The M-1.5 Zone area was subsequently changed to M-1.5-DP Zone. The M-1.5-DP Zone area was changed back to the A-2-5 Zone through Zone Change 2012-0055Z, effective December 27, 2012.

- 14. Certificate of Compliance for Lot Line Adjustment RLLA 201300007, recorded February 18, 2014, adjusted the land area owned by Chiquita Canyon Landfill from approximately 622 acres to 639 acres. The current Project Site is Parcel One of RLLA 201300007.
- 15. Chiquita Canyon Landfill was first approved for a land reclamation project by the Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") on December 21, 1965 through Zone Exception Case ("ZEC") 7879. ZEC 8040 was approved by the Commission for an access road related to the land reclamation project on March 8, 1966. On September 13, 1966 the Commission approved ZEC 8191 for refuse disposal and land reclamation project at the site. On March 2, 1977 the Commission approved CUP 1010 for continued operation and maintenance of a waste disposal facility and land reclamation project with appurtenant facilities. On November 24, 1982 the Commission approved CUP 1809 for expansion of the existing landfill with Class II and Class III disposal sites. CUP 89-081 was approved by the Board of Supervisors on May 20, 1997 for continued operation of a Class III landfill after the approval of the CUP by the Commission was appealed.
- 16. CUP 89-081 was to expire on November 24, 2019 or when the landfill reached a waste disposal limit of 23,000,000 tons, whichever occurred first. As the cumulative waste disposal tonnage was approaching the limit and it became clear that the Project would not have its environmental review process completed before a public hearing for renewal of the CUP could be held, the applicant requested a "Clean Hands Waiver" from the Director of the Department of Regional Planning ("Director") in November 2015. The Director granted the Clean Hands Waiver on March 17, 2016, pursuant to Section 22.04.110 of the County Code, subject to continued compliance with the CUP 89-081 conditions, with the exception of the 23,000,000 ton waste disposal limit. The waiver does not allow the landfill to exceed the 29.4 million ton threshold analyzed in the EIR for CUP 89-081. The waiver allows the landfill operations to continue on a temporary basis until the earlier of the following: a.) a final action is taken on the project (withdrawal, approval, or denial); b.) July 31, 2017; or c.) revocation of the waiver by the Director. In July 2016 the landfill reached and exceeded the 23 million ton limit, but it has been allowed to continue to operate in accordance with the Clean Hands Waiver.
- 17. The site plan for the Project, which is dated May 2015, depicts the Project Site, which has an overall area of approximately 639 acres, located on the north side of Henry Mayo Drive, and fronting Wolcott Way and Franklin Parkway at the southeast part of the site. New entrance facilities are proposed at Wolcott Way, including driveways, parking lots with a total of 32 parking spaces, scales and gatehouses, queuing area,

#### DRAFT FINDINGS PAGE 4 OF 19

administration building and a household hazardous waste facility. The main driveway leads to and from the main canyon landfill area. The main canyon includes 188 acres of previously approved landfill area covering much of the western portion of the Project Site. The main canyon also is to include a lateral extension of 26.9 acres to the south and 115.8 acres to the north and east, for a total expansion area of approximately 143 acres. Two closed landfill areas are also depicted, including the existing Primary Canyon Landfill, which covers 55 acres in the southerly part of the site, and the existing Canyon "B" Landfill, which covers 14 acres near the eastern edge of the Project Site. The existing and proposed landfill areas will have a combined area of 400 acres. A large storm water basin is located near the southwest corner of the site. There is another storm water basin northeast of the Canyon "B" Landfill area, and six smaller storm water basins near the entrance facilities. The existing entrance facilities and office are located immediately east of the large storm water basin near the southwest corner of the site, although these facilities will be removed and there will no longer be access directly from Henry Mayo Drive. The existing landfill gas-to-energy facility is located to the east of the Main Canyon Landfill near the center of the site. The future potential conversion technology facility is located north of Wolcott Way in the southeast part of the site and includes a separate driveway leading to Wolcott Way. Proposed borrow areas are shown to the east of the Primary Canyon Landfill and south of the Canyon "B" Landfill. Alternative facilities locations to the east and west of the main landfill are shown, which are support facilities for equipment storage and for maintenance purposes.

- 18. The total landfill area of 400 acres represents 62.6% of the total 639 acre Project Area. Most of the remaining area will also undergo some form of disturbance, including access roads, borrow areas, entrance facilities, future conversion technology setaside area, storm water basins, graded areas, and other areas of disturbance. The total potential impacted area covers 625.08 acres (97.8% of the Project Area), leaving just 14.30 acres (2.2%) of the Project Area outside the limit of disturbance.
- 19. The oak tree report dated June 6, 2014 depicts the oak tree locations. They include Oak Tree No. 1, which is a Valley Oak located close to the south property line, Oak Tree No. 2, a Coast Live Oak located close to the existing entrance area, Oak Tree No. 3, a Coast Live Oak in the south expansion area of the Main Canyon Landfill, and Oak Tree No. 89, a Coast Live Oak adjacent to the new queuing area west of Wolcott Way. Tree No. 89 is in poor condition while the others are rated as good in the oak tree report. All four oak trees have multiple trunks. The largest of the trunks belongs to Oak Tree No. 89, with a diameter of 18.5 inches for its largest trunk.
- 20. An Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code section 21000, et seq.) ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines for the County. A Draft EIR ("DEIR") and Partially Recirculated Draft EIR ("PRDEIR") have been completed for the Project. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") has been prepared to mitigate Project impacts to geology and hydrology, surface water drainage, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. Project impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels except for impacts to air

quality, greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations ("SOC") have been prepared for the Project.

- 21. The DEIR was released on July 10, 2014. It had a public comment period of 105 days, including 45 days for the initial comment period and two extensions of 30 days each. The public comment period for the DEIR closed on October 23, 2014. A Hearing Examiner public hearing was held at the Castaic Sports Complex on July 31, 2014 for the DEIR for the Project.
- 22. Subsequently it was determined that the following chapters of the DEIR needed to be revised and recirculated: Introduction, Project Description, Biological Resources, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change and Project Alternatives. The PRDEIR was released on November 9, 2016 and its public comment period of 61 days ended on January 9, 2017. The updated chapters, related appendices, a visual resources supplement, a traffic supplement, and an executive summary were included in the PRDEIR. A Hearing Examiner public hearing was held at the theater of West Ranch High School in Stevenson Ranch on December 15, 2016 for the PRDEIR for the Project.
- 23. The Final EIR ("FEIR") for the Project has been prepared. The FEIR consists of introductory explanatory material, an executive summary, the complete DEIR and PRDEIR, comments received concerning the DEIR and PRDEIR with responses to the comments, appendixes, supplements and the MMRP.
- 24. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the Zoning Code, the community was appropriately notified of the Project's public hearing by mail, newspaper, and property posting.
- 25. Department of Regional Planning ("DRP") staff ("Staff") has received a large number of letters and emails containing comments on the Project's DEIR and PRDEIR as well as oral testimony on each. For the DEIR a total of 38 written comments were received in support of the Project and 44 against the Project. At the Hearing Examiner hearing on July 31, 2014 three speakers spoke in support of the Project while 24 spoke in opposition. In addition, there were 17 letters from government of tribal agencies plus one from Southern California Edison regarding the DEIR received by Regional Planning and incorporated into the FEIR.
- 26. For the PRDEIR Staff received 294 written comment letters and emails in opposition to the project and only one in favor of the Project. The count of opposition comments included some that only asked for a time extension on the PRDEIR without necessarily stating opposition to the Project. At the December 15, 2016 Hearing Examiner hearing, there were 36 speakers at the hearing who testified against the project and seven who testified in favor. Additionally, 13 speaker cards were filled out by Project opponents who did not speak and one which didn't state any position on the landfill from someone who didn't speak. Many of the commenters submitted multiple comments or spoke at both hearings. There were nearly as many written comment letters in support of the Project as were opposed which were received during the DEIR comment period. However, nearly all of the written public comments for the PRDEIR

received during the public comment period were in opposition to the landfill. Copies of the comment letters received on the DEIR and PRDEIR and responses to the comments are included in the FEIR, along with topical responses.

- 27. The most frequent concerns expressed by the public and by other agencies have been potential impacts to public health, air quality, odors, and traffic. Some other frequent topics included environmental justice issues, biological resources, greenhouse gases, the CUP 89-081 conditions and 1997 community agreement, property values, project alternatives, and water quality. The FEIR contains detailed topical responses to 34 of the most common topics that were commented on by the public, and specific responses to each of the public comments. The project conditions, IMP, and MMRP include requirements that address many of the community concerns.
- 28. The most serious concerns are those regarding potential impacts to public health. The public health concerns include possible increases in cancer risk, asthma, respiratory diseases and other health risks resulting from proximity to the landfill and air emissions A health risk assessment was prepared in accordance with from the landfill. guidelines published by the State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD"), and is included as part of Air Quality chapter of the FEIR. The health risk assessment substantially overstates the actual risks associated with facility emissions in order to provide more assurance that the Project does not produce significant impacts to public health. The public health impacts fall below the significance thresholds established by SCAQMD, even though the risks associated with the facility are substantially overstated in the analysis. The actual impacts would be lower than what is shown in the analysis if the Project is approved with no increase in current waste tonnage rates, since it is based on an increase from 6,000 tons per day to 12,000 tons per day of waste disposed.
- 29. Seven additional letters of opposition and one email of opposition were received after the notice for the Commission public hearing was sent on January 24, 2017 up to the time the hearing package was prepared on February 16, 2017. DRP has also received phone calls from landfill opponents expressing their concerns.
- 30. Supporters of the Project submitted the following to DRP after the notice for the Commission public hearing was sent on January 24, 2017 up to the time the hearing package was prepared on February 16, 2017: a petition in support of the Project signed by 53 residents of Val Verde; 27 letters in Spanish signed by supporters of the Project; 23 letters of support for the Project from 2014; and 388 letters of support for the Project from 2017. The support letters are included in a package submitted by the Permittee, which includes a cover letter; a report discussing the correlation between beneficial use materials and performance at Chiquita Canyon Landfill; charts showing the origin of disposal materials and diversion materials by Supervisorial District; a list of odor management BMPs; information about the LFGTE plant; a list of regulatory agencies and permits associated with Chiquita Canyon Landfill; and a list of organizations which have supported Chiquita Canyon Landfill. The list of supporters includes the Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce, Santa Clarita Valley Economic Development Corporation, Los Angeles County Business Federation, SCV

Latino Chamber of Commerce, SCV Senior Center, Valley Industry Association, Castaic Chamber of Commerce, West Ranch Town Council, Child and Family Center, and many other groups and organizations. The letters of support include letters from some of these organizations, small business owners, residents, local waste haulers, and others.

- 31. A large number of letters were provided both in support of the Project and opposed as part of the supplemental hearing packages before the March 1, 2017 hearing. A large number of additional letters have been received since then as well, both in favor of the Project and in opposition. An exact count of the additional letters has not been done, but the majority have been form letters in support of the Project.
- 32. The existing landfill use is consistent with the current zoning and land use category of the property. It serves an important function as the second largest landfill in the County and has been operating since 1972. Its location behind mountains largely shields the operations from view from surrounding areas, and the Permittee has managed the operations in a responsible manner. The landfill provides free clean-up days for residents of Val Verde, the nearest existing residential community. However, the landfill has still generated much concern in surrounding communities, especially Val Verde, including complaints of foul odors from many neighborhood residents, as well concerns about traffic, air quality, and health impacts.
- 33. The permittee has taken steps to respond to the concerns. The landfill rejects at the scales trucks where loads are obviously highly odorous. If a highly odorous load is detected while unloading, the waste is covered immediately to control the odors. The permittee regularly exceeds state minimum standards and the normal recommended practices to cover trash and other areas of the landfill proactively to minimize odors from fresh trash. Large portable fans are used to control air flow and dilute and disperse odors. When a combination of odorous loads and certain weather conditions occurs, a perimeter odor control system is used to disperse odor neutralizing agents to control odors.
- 34. The existing residential community of Val Verde is located to the northeast of the Project Site. The nearest residence is located on Roosevelt Avenue in the south part of Val Verde and is approximately 500 feet from the Project Site and approximately 1,100 feet from the developed area of the Project Site. Steep hillsides separate the Project Site from Val Verde.
- 35. A United States Post Office distribution facility is located immediately to the east of the Project Site. The nearest structure is approximately 150 feet from the Project Site, which is part of the Post Office facility. Other industrial uses of the Valencia Commerce Center are located to the east and north of the Project Site. Franklin Parkway connects the Valencia Commerce Center to Wolcott Way, where the new entrance facilities are proposed.
- 36. The Project's new entrance facilities off of Wolcott Way, the related street improvements required for the Project and the closure of the existing entrance facilities will improve traffic flow in the area and avoid queuing of trucks on the Highway 126.

A condition requires the closure of the existing entrance on Highway 126 and relocation of the entrance to Wolcott Way within one year of the effective date of the CUP. This will help to alleviate many of the traffic issues in the area.

- 37. Some of the right-of-way and street improvement requirements include the following: full street improvements on Wolcott Way and Franklin Parkway within the Project frontage; dedication of right-of-way at a minimum of 70 feet from the centerline of Highway 126; exclusive right turn lanes and transition improvements in the event the Project traffic volumes exceed road capacity; slope easements at the interchange of Highway 126 and Wolcott Way; offsite improvements identified in the approved Traffic Study analysis; payment of fees for the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District; installation of drainage structures; and installation of street lights on concrete poles with underground wiring.
- 38. Project hours of operation for receiving solid waste and beneficial use materials shall be limited as indicated in the Conditions of Approval. Other facility operations, such as site preparation and maintenance, equipment maintenance, waste processing and the application of cover, shall be restricted to the hours of 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. This restriction excludes facility operations requiring continuous operation, such as gas control.
- 39. The organic waste composting operation of the Project will provide an opportunity to recycle and beneficially use organic waste materials. It will be enclosed to minimize the potential for objectionable odors to adversely affect the community. The household hazardous waste facility will be open to the public and would potentially be open up to seven days per week between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., and shall be staffed continuously with a person(s) trained in hazardous material handling and management. The materials that may be accepted by the facility include, but are not limited to used motor oil, used latex paints, used anti-freeze, used batteries and other household wastes defined in the Operating Agreement. The facility may not be used for general use by commercial or industrial entities. It would allow for residents to safely dispose of hazardous household wastes. This will help to prevent such materials from being improperly disposed.
- 40. The land set aside for a future conversion technology facility would provide an opportunity to convert waste into energy or other useful products. Conversion technologies are non-combustion thermal, mechanical, and biological processes that convert post-recycled materials (which would otherwise be sent to landfills) into green fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel, clean renewable energy, and other marketable products. A conversion technology facility will help to meet County objectives and state legislation to advance conversion technologies.
- 41. The continuing operation of the existing LFGTE plant will provide power to the local electrical grid. These uses will provide benefits to the County as a whole and to the local community.
- 42. A duly noticed public hearing was held on March 1, 2017 before the Regional Planning Commission at Rancho Pico Junior High School in Stevenson Ranch. A presentation

#### DRAFT FINDINGS PAGE 9 OF 19

on the Project was given by DRP and Department of Public Works staff. Mike Dean, the Project representative for the Permittee, gave a presentation in support of the project. Members of the public were then given the opportunity to testify. A total of 67 speakers testified before time expired, including 29 in favor of the Project, 37 opposed to the Project, and one who expressed concerns but did not favor or oppose the Project. Due to the limited time available, 41 people who signed up to speak were unable to do so. Some of the concerns cited by landfill opponents were related to the following issues: traffic, air quality impacts, odors, water quality impacts, property values, leakage of methane, public health impacts, alleged violation of a previous agreement with the community, environmental justice concerns, biological resource impacts, and availability of alternatives, notably Mesquite Canyon Landfill. Because of the large number of people who signed up to speak who were unable to do so, and because the Commission had questions about the Project and wanted time to review the supplemental materials that had been submitted for the Project, the Commission approved a motion to continue the hearing on April 19, 2017. The Commission also gave instructions to Staff, including responding to guestions on the Project and arranging for a location for remote testimony during the April 19 continued hearing, so that residents of the area will have an opportunity to testify without travelling to Downtown Los Angeles.

- 43. The Commission finds that the Project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan ("General Plan"). The Project is located within the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan ("Area Plan"), a component of the General Plan. Both the General Plan and the Area Plan contain policies to ensure compatibility of development with the surrounding area and the Project is consistent with both plans.
- 44. The Commission finds that the Project is consistent with the uses allowed in the Community Serving (P-CS) land use category of the Area Plan. This designation includes landfills among the allowable uses that are listed, subject to the underlying zoning designation requirements.
- 45. The Commission finds that the Project adequately addresses the issues in the statement in Chapter 2 of the Area Plan, the Land Use Element, on page 26 discussing the Val Verde Community, which says, "Major planning issues for Val Verde include potential nuisance impacts from expansion of the landfill in Chiquita Canyon, the compatibility of proposed developments with the village's rural character, and providing residents with increased access to employment opportunities, social services, and adequate infrastructure."
- 46. The Commission finds that the Project Conditions of Approval, Implementation and Monitoring Program ("IMP") and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") are designed to avoid or mitigate potential nuisance impacts to surrounding communities, including Val Verde, and to ensure that the landfill operates safely and efficiently. The Conditions of Approval require that the fees collected from the landfill will be used to fund programs and activities that enhance Countywide disposal capacity, mitigate landfill impacts in the unincorporated County areas, promote development of Conversion Technology facilities that benefit the Santa Clarita Valley and the County, and fund environmental, educational, and quality of life programs in

unincorporated areas surrounding the landfill. The Conditions of Approval require that quarterly clean-up days be provided for residents of Val Verde. One mitigation measure from the MMRP requires the development of an Odor Impact Minimization Plan, and there is also a condition requiring a response by the Permittee to address air quality and odor complaints. Such response would include working with the regulatory agencies to systematically address each complaint and specific steps to resolve such complaints. MMRP mitigation measures also require using innovative approaches to reducing potential air emissions from building construction, use of Best Management Practices ("BMPs") to reduce emissions from construction and operations and use of BMPs to improve landfill gas collection efficiency.

The IMP requires annual monitoring reports to enhance the continuing oversight of landfill operations and supplement routine enforcement activities, and to provide accountability to show compliance with all requirements. The annual report also is required to summarize measures taken by the Permittee to divert and recycle materials, to promote and implement appropriate alternative technologies, to mitigate nuisance odors and other complaints, to minimize truck traffic, and to ensure the effectiveness and adequacy of landfill gas collection, to report on revegetation, as well as a detailed report on the quantities and types of materials received by the landfill and other pertinent information. These are just a few examples Conditions of Approval, IMP requirements, and MMRP mitigation measures that help to avoid or mitigate potential nuisance impacts and to ensure that the landfill is operating safely and efficiently.

- 47. The Commission finds that the Project will help the County to meet its future waste disposal capacity needs while adequately addressing the concerns raised in the statement in the Land Use Element of the Area Plan on page 46 discussing landfills in the Santa Clarita Valley, including Chiquita Canyon Landfill. The section states that Chiquita Canyon Landfill is one of the three Class III landfills that primarily serve the Santa Clarita Valley, along with Antelope Valley Landfill and Sunshine Canyon Landfill. It further states, *"With approved expansions these landfills will have the capacity to serve the Valley beyond year 2020. However, the proposed expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill has raised concerns by residents of nearby Val Verde, who are often impacted by wind-borne odors and truck traffic. Compatibility of Landfills with adjacent development must continue to be addressed."*
- 48. The Commission finds that the Project would help to meet the need for new landfill space and to promote diversion of materials from landfills as discussed on Page 46 of the Area Plan. This section of the Area Plan mentions programs in the City of Santa Clarita and County to reduce waste generation through diversion programs such as recycling and re-use, and says, *"Although these efforts will increase the life expectancy of local landfills, they do not eliminate the need for new landfill space."* It mentions the need for facilities *"for sorting and resource recovery from solid waste, including materials recovery facilities (MRFs), composting facilities, collection centers for electronic waste (such as discarded computers and televisions), and recycling facilities."*

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is by far the main landfill used by the City of Santa Clarita and the unincorporated areas of the Santa Clarita Valley. In 2015, 90% of the waste generated in the City of Santa Clarita was disposed at Chiquita Canyon Landfill, as was 77% of the waste for the unincorporated areas of the Santa Clarita Valley. It is a vital component of the waste disposal infrastructure of the County and for the Santa Clarita Valley, and its continued operation and expansion will help to meet the need for landfill space as described in the Area Plan.

The Project proposes to add a household hazardous waste facility ("HHWF") and composting operation. An area for a future conversion technology facility has been set aside on the Project Site. Continued operation of the landfill and implementation of the HHWF and composting will help to achieve the goals of the Area Plan. Truck traffic impacts will be reduced due to the new entrance facilities off of Wolcott Way, which will reduce traffic impacts on Henry Mayo Drive. Project conditions and mitigation measures will help to minimize potentially adverse effects such as odors.

49. The Commission finds that the following policies of the Area Plan are applicable to the proposed project:

Land Use Element Policy LU-9.1.3: "Protect major utility transmission corridors, pumping stations, reservoirs, booster stations, and other similar facilities from encroachment by incompatible uses, while allowing non-intrusive uses such as plant nurseries, greenbelts, and recreational trails." A portion of SCE's existing Saugus-Elizabeth Lake-Fillmore 66 kilovolt (kV) Subtransmission Line is proposed for relocation in order to accommodate landfill improvements. Landfill operations will not interfere with the transmission lines.

Land Use Element Policy LU-9.1.6: "Coordinate with appropriate agencies and organizations to ensure that landfill expansion needs are met while minimizing adverse impacts to Valley residents." The appropriate County departments and state agencies have coordinated extensively in reviewing the proposed landfill expansion and in developing appropriate mitigation measures and conditions. Other organizations have been included in the environmental and permit consultation process, and their comments, as well as analyses of the potential adverse impacts of the Project to area residents, have been taken into consideration in this process.

50. The Commission finds that the following policies of the General Plan are applicable to the proposed project:

General Plan Public Services and Facilities Element Policy PS/F 5.1: "Maintain an efficient, safe and responsive waste management system that reduces waste while protecting the health and safety of the public." Chiquita Canyon Landfill is an important part of the County's waste management system. Project conditions and mitigation measures are designed to ensure that the landfill is operated in a safe and efficient manner.

General Plan Public Services and Facilities Element Policy PS/F 5.2: "Ensure adequate disposal capacity by providing for environmentally sound and technically

#### DRAFT FINDINGS PAGE 12 OF 19

feasible development of solid waste management facilities, such as landfills and transfer/processing facilities." In 2015, the amount of waste disposed in or from Los Angeles County was 9,721,311 tons. Class III landfills in the County accounted for 4,772,823 tons, or approximately 49.1% of the total. The three largest landfills in the County had the following amounts of waste disposed in 2015: Sunshine Canyon Landfill, 2,402,704 tons; Chiquita Canyon Landfill, 1,075,207 tons, and Antelope Valley Landfill, 488,807 tons. Chiquita Canyon Landfill accounted for 22.5% of the waste disposed in Class III landfills in the County and 11.1% of the total solid waste for the County in 2015. In 2015, 4,127,261 tons, or approximately 42.5% of solid waste from the County was transported to landfills outside the County. In 2015, 2.7% of the County's solid waste was disposed at an inert waste landfill and 5.7% was disposed at transformation facilities. The sources of waste at CCL in 2015 were as follows: City of Santa Clarita 13%, unincorporated Los Angeles County 5%, City of Los Angeles 55%, Santa Monica 6%, other cities in Los Angeles County 19% and outside of Los Angeles County 2%.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill provides the County significant capacity to help meet its current waste disposal needs and in meeting the projected needs as anticipated in the Integrated Waste Management Plan for Los Angeles County. The Project Conditions, MMRP, and IMP provide requirements to ensure that the landfill implements recognized best practices and technological advancements in a way that is environmentally sound while helping to meet the County's waste disposal capacity needs.

General Plan Public Services and Facilities Element Policy PS/F 5.4: "Encourage solid waste management facilities that utilize conversion and other alternative technologies and waste to energy facilities." The Project includes continued operation of a landfill gas-to-energy ("LFGTE") facility. The Project Site includes an existing 9.2 megawatt LGTFE plant operated by Ameresco Chiquita Energy LLC. The LGTFE plant uses gases extracted from the landfill through an onsite gas collection system and converts it into energy, which is delivered to the local electrical grid. It provides enough energy to power approximately 10,000 homes per year. The plant is staffed with two full time employees and operates 24 hours a day, seven days per week, and operates independently of the landfill. An area of land on the Project Site has been set aside for a future conversion technology facility.

General Plan Public Services and Facilities Element Policy PS/F 5.5: "Reduce the County's waste stream by minimizing waste generation and enhancing diversion." The Project includes diversion of waste materials from disposal and putting them to beneficial use. Some examples of beneficial use materials diverted from the waste stream include: shredded curbside green waste, which is used for temporary slope stabilization, erosion control, fugitive dust control and alternative daily cover; treated auto shredder waste, used as alternative daily cover; shredded tires, used to protect the methane gas pipeline system as trench backfill for the construction of the landfill gas collection system; and construction and demolition debris, including concrete and other materials used to build all-weather roads and other surfaces onsite.

General Plan Public Services and Facilities Element Policy PS/F 5.6: "Encourage the use and procurement of recyclable and biodegradable materials." The Project includes an organic waste composing facility. The composting facility would allow up to 560 tons per day of green waste, food waste, and other organic waste materials for composting. The organic material is to be processed on site for distribution and use as mulch, biomass fuel and compost. Some of these materials would be used onsite as beneficial use materials, and other materials would be available to customers who would use the materials offsite.

- 51. The Commission finds that the proposed use is consistent with the A-2 zoning classification because land reclamation projects, such as a landfill, are permitted within this zone with a CUP pursuant to Section 22.24.150 of the County Code.
- 52. The Commission finds that the Project satisfies the Conditional Use Permit Burden of Proof findings in Section 22.56.040 of the County Code.
- 53. The Commission finds that the Project will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing and working in the surrounding area, and will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the Project Site, and will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, and general welfare. The Project is an established use that has been a part of the community for decades and continues to provide a safe location for the disposal of waste for both the Santa Clarita Valley and the rest of Los Angeles County. The Project is subject to close oversight and regulation by County and State agencies such as DPH, Public Works and CalRecycle. It is subject to Conditions of Approval, an MMRP and IMP designed to avoid adverse impacts to the community and to the environment and to ensure effective and safe landfill operations.
- 54. The Commission finds that the Project Site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking, landscaping, and other development features as is required in order to integrate the Project into the surrounding area. The Site is 639 acres, of which 400 acres is designated as landfill area, including closed areas of the site. There is ample room for parking, access, and all other facilities needed for the Project's operations.
- 55. The Commission finds that the Project is adequately served by highways of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind of traffic such uses would generate, and by other public or private facilities as are required. The Project Site fronts State Highway 126, Franklin Parkway and Wolcott Way. New entrance facilities are required for the Project on Wolcott Way. Right-of-way and street improvements are required to satisfy the requirements of Public Works and the California Department of Transportation, and are described in detail in the draft conditions and are summarized in the Neighborhood Impact/Land Use Compatibility section of this report. The new facilities will improve the traffic circulation in the area and help to avoid queuing of trucks onto the highway. The traffic-related improvements required for the Project, including the required road improvements and contribution to the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District will adequately offset the Project's traffic

impacts. Therefore, the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of vehicle traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required.

- 56. The Commission finds that Project meets the Burden of Proof requirements for an Oak Tree Permit as listed in Section 22.56.2100 of the County Code.
- 57. The Commission finds that the proposed construction of the proposed use will be accomplished without endangering the health of the remaining trees subject to Part 16 of Title 22 of the County Code, on the subject property. Four oak trees are to be removed, which are the only known ordinance-sized oak trees on the Project Site. Their removal is required due to the location of the trees in the areas needed for the new entrance facilities, landfill expansion area, and related grading. They shall be replaced by eight mitigation oak trees on the Project Site. Other oak trees shall not be endangered. Any future impacts to oak trees and oak woodlands will not be allowed until an Oak Tree and Woodland Mitigation Plan has been approved by Regional Planning, in accordance with Mitigation Measure BR-15 of the MMRP, and the required mitigation measures will need to be implemented for any such impacts to ensure the protection of oak trees and oak woodlands.
- 58. The Commission finds that the removal of the oak trees proposed will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. Site grading shall be accomplished only after receiving a grading permit from Public Works. Such grading shall be done appropriately to avoid any erosion or increased runoff unless adequately mitigated to the satisfaction of Public Works and in compliance with the Project's MMRP mitigation measures, and with the applicable regulations, such as the Low Impact Development requirements. Related mitigation measures include a requirement to retain a qualified engineer to evaluate the site's potential for debris flow and to recommend design provisions for control and cleanup of debris flows; to perform design-level geotechnical investigations to identify areas of expansive or collapsible soils in relation to buildings or structures and to perform additional testing if deemed necessary by the Project geotechnical and civil engineers; and to retain a qualified engineer to evaluate the surface water drainage and to make recommendations with regard to drainage issues.
- 59. The Commission finds that in addition to the above facts, at least one of the following findings apply:
  - a. That the removal or relocation of the oak tree(s) proposed is necessary as continued existence at present location(s) frustrates the planned improvement or proposed use of the subject property to such an extent that:

i. Alternative development plans cannot achieve the same permitted density or that the cost of such alternative would be prohibitive, or

ii. Placement of such tree(s) precludes the reasonable and efficient use of such property for a use otherwise authorized, or

- b. That the oak tree(s) proposed for removal or relocation interferes with utility services or streets and highways, either within or outside of the subject property, and no reasonable alternative to such interference exists other than removal of the tree(s), or
- c. That the condition of the oak tree(s) proposed for removal with reference to seriously debilitating disease or danger or falling is such that it cannot be remedied through reasonable preservation procedures and practices;

The oak tree removals are necessary due to their location near the new entrance facilities, landfill expansion area, and related grading. There is no feasible alternate entrance area or landfill expansion area.

- 60. The Commission finds that the removal of the oak trees proposed will not be contrary to or be in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the oak tree permit procedure. The oak tree removals are necessary to accomplish the Project, and the mitigation trees will compensate for the loss of the trees to be removed. The oak tree permit procedure shall be properly followed and enforced.
- 61. The Commission finds that the Project Site is located within the Castaic Area Community Standards District ("CSD"). The CSD contains restrictions on development within 50 feet of primary significant ridgelines and within 25 feet of secondary significant ridgelines. The primary significant ridgelines on the Project Site are located along or close to the northern and western property lines. Two short sections of secondary ridgelines are located in the southwest part of the Project Site. No grading or development is proposed within the protected areas of any significant ridgelines.
- 62. The Commission finds that an OTP is required for the Project because of the four oak trees the Permittee proposes to remove, pursuant to Section 22.56.2060 of the County Code. The Project is subject to the requirements for an OTP in Part 16 of Chapter 22.56 of the County Code and is in compliance with the requirements. A replacement ratio of two to one is required for the trees to be removed, for a total of eight mitigation trees required. OTP conditions are included at the end of the Project's Conditions of Approval.
- 63. The Commission finds that the Project shall comply with the setback requirements of the County Code. The A-2 Zone requires minimum setbacks of 20 feet in front, five feet on the sides and 15 feet in the rear, pursuant to Sections 22.24.170 A and 22.20.120 of the County Code. The proposed structures, landfill expansion areas, and other uses on the Project Site are located well outside of the required setback areas, as shown on the Exhibit "A" site plan for the Project. The landfill expansion area is approximately 70 feet from the property line at the closest point, and proposed structures are at least 70 feet from property lines.
- 64. The Commission finds that the amount of parking provided is adequate for the Project. The amount of parking required for the administrative office building is one space per 400 square feet, pursuant to the requirement for business or professional offices in

Section 22.52.1100 of the County Code. Based on an area of approximately 4,800 square feet, this building is required to have 12 parking spaces. Parking required for the household hazardous waste facility is eight spaces, based on an area of approximately 2,100 square feet and one required parking space per 250 square feet for general commercial uses pursuant to Section 22.52.1100 of the County Code. The current Exhibit "A" site plan for the Project shows 23 parking spaces provided for the administrative office building and nine spaces for the household hazardous waste facility. The parking to be provided meets the County Code requirements for the uses on the site.

- 65. The Commission finds that it is necessary to limit the term of the grant to thirty (30) years, or when the disposal limit of 60 million tons is reached, or when the landfill reaches its Limits of Fill as depicted on Exhibit "A" (Elevation 1,430 feet Alternative), whichever occurs first. Periodic Reviews are to be conducted at ten (10) and twenty (20) years after approval. At each of the periodic reviews the permittee would submit a Permit Compliance Study, an updated Closure Plan, updated Post-Closure Maintenance Plan, and a comprehensive study to analyze the long-term solid waste disposal needs of the Santa Clarita Valley, as required by the CUP conditions. After consultation with all applicable County departments, a report and recommendations would be prepared and presented by Staff to a Hearing Officer at a public hearing. The Hearing Officer would make a decision on the Periodic Review, which may be appealed to the Commission, whose decision would be final. The purpose of the Periodic Reviews is to consider new or changed circumstances, such as physical development near the Project Site, future waste disposal needs of the County and of the Santa Clarita Valley, improved technological innovations in environmental protection and control systems, and other best management practices that might significantly improve the operations of the facility, and to determine if any changes to the IMP are warranted based on the changed circumstances. The IMP may be modified if needed at either or both of the periodic reviews to ensure that the landfill will continue to operate in a safe and effective manner.
- 66. The Commission finds that the Project is consistent with the County's General Plan, and the solid waste disposal needs of the region were considered and balanced against the needs of local residents and available fiscal and environmental resources.
- 67. The Commission finds that a Final EIR for the Project was prepared in accordance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR, along with its associated MMRP and Findings and SOC, and found that it reflects the independent judgment of the Commission. The Findings and SOC are incorporated herein by this reference, as if set forth in full.
- 68. The Commission finds that after considering the Final EIR and the MMRP, together with any comments during the public review process, on the basis of the whole record before it, with the mitigation measures set forth and carried out through the MMRP, and other than the environmental impacts set forth in the Findings and SOC, there is no substantial evidence that the Project would have a significant effect on the environment.

- 69. The Commission finds that an MMRP consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Final EIR was prepared, and its requirements are incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for the Project.
- 70. The Commission finds that the MMRP prepared in conjunction with the Final EIR identified in detail how compliance with its measures will mitigate or avoid potential adverse impacts to the environment by the Project.
- 71. The Commission finds that the fees required in Condition Nos. 17 and 112 through 123 are necessary to offset the costs associated with Project mitigation, enforcement activities, studies, programs, community benefits, and other costs related to the Project.
- 72. The Commission finds that the out-of-area fee in Condition No. 115 was created for two primary reasons: to be used to encourage development of future alternatives to landfills and to serve as a disincentive to those who bring trash originating outside of the Santa Clarita Valley. This fee will have the benefit of encouraging preservation of landfill capacity for the Santa Clarita Valley and to assist in mitigating significant air quality impacts of the Project. The generated fee will be used to fund the following programs, with one-third (33.3%) of the total for each: 1.) Landfill Mitigation Program, 2.) Unincorporated Community Program, and 3.) Alternative-to-Landfilling Technology Program. If the on-site Conversion Technology facility is developed, then the out-of-area fee would be reduced by one-third (33.3%), the share for the Alternative-to-Landfilling Technology Program, and the fees would thereafter be divided in half, with 50% going to each of the remaining two programs.
- 73. Approval of this Project is conditioned on the Permittee's compliance with the attached MMRP and Conditions of Approval for the CUP and the Oak Tree Permit.
- 74. The Commission finds that this Project is subject to the provisions of section 711.4 of the California Fish and Wildlife Code and the regulations of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
- 75. The Commission finds that pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper, property posting, library posting and Department of Regional Planning website posting. All 67 neighboring property owners within 1,000 feet of the Project Site were notified by mail, as were the 23 people or groups on the courtesy list for the Newhall Zoned District, 54 additional people who requested notification concerning the Project, and all 694 households residing in Val Verde. Additionally, the case materials are available on the Regional Planning website and at the Castaic Library and Valencia Library.
- 76. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such

documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Zoning Permits North Section, Department of Regional Planning.

## BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES THAT:

- A. The proposed use with the attached conditions will be consistent with the adopted General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.
- B. The proposed use at the site will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.
- C. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area.
- D. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required.
- E. The proposed construction of the proposed use will be accomplished without endangering the health of the remaining trees subject to Part 16 of Title 22 of the County Code, on the subject property.
- F. The encroachment of the oak trees proposed will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated.
- G. In addition to the above facts, the following finding applies: The encroachment of the oak trees proposed is necessary as continued existence at the present locations frustrates the planned improvement or proposed use of the subject property to such an extent that alternative development plans cannot achieve the same permitted density or that the cost of such alternative would be prohibitive.
- H. The encroachment of the oak trees proposed will not be contrary to or be in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the oak tree permit procedure.

#### THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the EIR for the Project was completed in compliance with CEQA and the State and County Guidelines related thereto; certifies that it independently reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission as to the environmental consequences of the Project; and finds that on the basis of the whole record that the

significant adverse effects of the Project, as described in the EIR, have either been reduced to an acceptable level or are outweighed by specific social, economic, legal, technological, or other considerations of the Project as stated in the attached Findings and SOC for the Project;

- 2. Certifies that the MMRP for the Project is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during Project implementation;
- 3. Certifies that it adopted the EIR, the Findings and SOC, and the MMRP at the conclusion of the public hearing; and
- 4. Approves Conditional Use Permit No. 200400042 and Oak Tree Permit No. 201500007, subject to the attached conditions.

#### ACTION DATE: April 19, 2017

SZD:RC April 6, 2017

c: Zoning Enforcement, Building and Safety

#### DRAFT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECT NO. R2004-00559-(5) CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 200400042 OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 201500007

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project seeks to continue the operation and maintenance of a solid waste disposal facility at the Chiquita Canyon Landfill ("CCL"). The project will increase the permitted disposal area laterally by 149 acres to a total area of 400 acres to accommodate new waste and may have a maximum permitted elevation of 1,430 feet. This project has an annual limit of intake of combined solid waste and beneficial use materials not to exceed 2,100,000 tons per year ("tpy"). Also, the project will relocate the site entrance from Henry Mayo Drive (SR-126) to Wolcott Way.

The project anticipates an average daily quantity of solid waste and beneficial use materials of 6,730 tons per day ("tpd"), but, the daily intake of these materials has a maximum limit of 12,000 tpd a day. This average provides for the same allowance of daily disposal limits of 5,000 tpd of solid waste, but adds a daily limit and average for beneficial use materials as well, the latter of which was not conditioned in the 1997 permit (CUP 89-081). The quantity of all materials received for processing, disposal and beneficial use at CCL shall not exceed 175,000 tons per month.

The project also provides for the development and operation of an on-site household hazardous facility and a closed mixed organics composting operation (anaerobic digestion) while setting-aside a portion of the subject site for possible future development of a conversion technology facility.

The project is approved through Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200400042 for the landfill and ancillary facilities and by Oak Tree Permit ("OAK") No. 201500007 for the removal of four oak trees. The project is subject to the following conditions of approval:

#### **GENERAL CONDITIONS**

- 1. Definitions: Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the following definitions shall apply to these Conditions of Approval ("Conditions"), and to the attached Implementation and Monitoring Program ("IMP"), adopted concurrently with this grant:
  - a. "Abandoned Waste" shall mean abandoned items such as mattresses, couches, doors, carpet, toilets, E-waste, and other furnitures.
  - b. "ADC" shall mean Alternative Daily Cover as permitted by Title 14 and title 27 of the California Code of Regulation, Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Local Enforcement Agency.

- c. "Alternative-to-Landfilling Technology" shall mean a technology capable of processing post-recycled or Residual Waste and other emerging technologies, in lieu of land disposal.
- d. "Anaerobic Digestion Facility" shall mean facility that utilizes organic wastes as a feedstock from which to produce biogas.
- e. "Ancillary Facilities" shall mean the facilities authorized by this grant that are directly related to the operation and maintenance of the Landfill, and shall not include the facilities related to any other enterprise operated by the Permittee or any other person or entity, unless otherwise specifically authorized by this grant.
- f. "Approval Date" shall mean the date of the Commission's approval of this grant, or the Board's approval if appealed.
- g. "Automobile Shredder Waste" shall mean the predominantly nonmetallic materials that remain after separating ferrous and nonferrous metal from shredder output.
- h. "Beneficial Use Materials" shall mean: (1) material imported to the Landfill that has been source-separated or otherwise processed and put to a beneficial use at the Facility, or separated or otherwise diverted from the waste stream and exported from the Facility, for purposes of recycling or reuse, and shall include, but not be limited to, green waste and other compostable organic materials, wood waste, asphalt, concrete, or dirt; (2) imported Clean Dirt that is used to prepare interim and final fill slopes for planting and for berms, provided that such importation of Clean Dirt has been shown to be necessary and has been authorized by the Department of Public Works; and (3) all ADC material types as permitted by this grant. Only materials that are appropriate for the specific use and in accordance with engineering, industry guidelines, or other standard practices in accordance with 14 CCR § 20686 may be classified as Beneficial Use Materials.
- i. "Biomass" shall mean any organic material not derived from fossil fuels, such as agricultural crop residues, bark, lawn, yard and garden clippings, leaves, silvicultural residue, tree and brush pruning, wood and wood chips, and wood waste, including these materials when separated from other waste streams. Biomass shall not include material containing sewage sludge, industrial sludge, medical waste, hazardous waste, or either highlevel or low-level radioactive waste.
- j. "Biosolid" shall mean the organic byproduct material resulting from the treatment of sewage sludge and wastewater.
- k. "Board" shall mean the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

- I. "CAC" shall mean the Community Advisory Committee whose members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors who will serve as a liaison between the Permittee and the community.
- m. "CalRecycle" shall mean the State of California Department of Resource Recycling and Recovery or its successor agency.
- n. "Caltrans" shall mean the State of California Department of Transportation.
- o. "CARB" shall mean California Air Resources Board.
- p. "CEO" shall mean the Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office.
- q. "Class III (non-hazardous) Landfill" shall mean a disposal facility that accepts non-hazardous Solid Waste for land disposal pursuant to a solid waste facilities permit and applicable federal and state laws and regulations.
- r. "Clean Dirt" shall mean soil, other than Contaminated Soil, that is not mixed with any other material and that is used for coverage of the Landfill face, buttressing the Landfill and construction of access roads, berms, and other beneficial uses at the Facility.
- s. "Closure" shall mean the process during which the Facility, or portion thereof, is no longer receiving Solid Waste and/or Beneficial Use Materials for disposal or processing and is undergoing all operations necessary to prepare the Facility, or portion thereof, for Post-Closure Maintenance in accordance with a CalRecycle approved plan for Closure or partial final closure. Said plans shall be concurred by the TAC, as defined in this grant.
- t. "Closure Date" shall mean "Termination Date," as defined in this grant.
- u. "Commission" shall mean the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission.
- v. "Composting" shall mean the controlled or uncontrolled biological decomposition of organic wastes.
- w. "Compostable Organic Materials" shall mean any food waste, green waste, landscape and pruning waste, non hazardous wood waste, and food-soiled paper waste that is mixed in with food material and when accumulated will become active compost.
- x. "Construction and Demolition Debris" shall mean material, other than hazardous waste, radioactive waste, or medical waste, that is generated by or results from construction or demolition-related activities including, but not limited to: construction, deconstruction, demolition, excavation, land cleaning, landscaping, reconstruction, remodeling, renovation, repair, and site clean-up. Construction and Demolition Debris includes, but is not

4

limited to: asphalt, concrete, brick, lumber, gypsum wallboard, cardboard and other associated packaging, roofing material, ceramic file, carpeting, plastic pipe, steel, rock, soil, gravel, tree stumps, and other vegetative matter.

- y. "Contaminated Soil" shall mean soil that 1) contains designated or nonhazardous material as set forth in Title 23, Chapter 15, Article 1, section 2510 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations, including petroleum hydrocarbons, such as gasoline and its components (benzene, toluene, xylene, and ethylbenzene), diesel and its components (benzene), virgin oil, motor oil, or aviation fuel, and lead as an associated metal; and, 2) has been determined pursuant to section 13263(a) of the Water Code to be a waste that requires regulation by the RWQCB or Local Oversight Agency.
- z. "Conversion Technologies" shall mean the various state-of-the-art technologies capable of converting post-recycled or residual Solid Waste into useful products, green fuels, and renewable energy through non-combustion thermal, chemical, or biological processes.
- aa. "Conversion Technology Facility" shall mean a facility that processes Solid Waste into useful products, fuels, and/or energy through anaerobic and other non-combustion thermal, chemical, or biological processes.
- bb. "County" shall mean the County of Los Angeles.
- cc. "County Code" shall mean the Los Angeles County Code.
- dd. "CPI" shall mean Consumer Price Index as adjusted on July 1 of each year at a minimum rate of 2 (%) percent.
- ee. "Department of Regional Planning" shall mean the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.
- ff. "Director of Regional Planning" shall mean the Director of the Department of Regional Planning and his or her designees.
- gg. "Disposal" shall mean the final disposition of Solid Waste onto land into the atmosphere, or into the waters of the State of California. Disposal includes the management of Solid Waste through the Landfill process at the Facility.
- hh. "Disposal Area" shall mean the "Landfill" as defined in this grant.
- ii. "DPH" shall mean the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health acting as the LEA as appropriate. DPH is currently designated as the LEA by the Board pursuant to the provisions of Division 30 of the California Public Resources Code to permit and inspect Solid Waste disposal facilities and to enforce State regulations and permits governing these facilities. For

5

purposes of this grant, DPH shall also include any successor LEA governing these facilities.

- jj. "Effective Date" shall mean the date of the Permittee's acceptance and use of this grant as defined in Condition No. 3.
- kk. "Electronic Waste" shall mean all discarded consumer or business electronic equipment or devices. Electronic waste includes materials specified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 23, Article 1 (commencing with Section 66273.3), and any amendments thereto.
- II. "Environmental Protection and Control Systems" shall mean any surface water and ground water-quality monitoring/control systems, landfill gas monitoring/control systems, landscaping and irrigation systems, drainage and grading facilities, Closure activities, Post-Closure Maintenance activities, foreseeable corrective actions, and other routine operation or maintenance facilities or activities.
- mm. "Facility" shall mean the entirety of the subject property as depicted on the attached Exhibit "A", including all areas where Landfill and non-Landfill activities occur.
- nn. "Final Cover" shall mean the cover material required for Closure of the Landfill and all Post-Closure Maintenance required by this grant.
- oo. "Footprint" shall mean the horizontal boundaries of the Landfill at ground level, as depicted on the attached Exhibit "A".
- pp. "Household Hazardous Waste" shall mean leftover household products that contain corrosive, toxic, ignitable, or reactive ingredients, other than used oil.
- qq. "Inert Debris" shall mean Solid Waste and/or recyclable materials that are source-separated or separated for recycling, reuse, or resale that do not contain: (1) hazardous waste, as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66261.3; or (2) soluble pollutants at concentrations in excess of state water quality objectives; and (3) do not contain significant quantities of decomposable waste. Inert Debris shall not contain more than 1 percent (by weight) putrescible waste. Inert Debris may be commingled with rock and/or soil.
- rr. "Inert Waste" shall mean a non-liquid solid waste including, but not limited to, soil and concrete, that does not contain hazardous waste or soluble pollutants at concentrations in excess of applicable water-quality objectives established by a regional water board pursuant to division 7 (commencing

with section 13000) of the California Water Code (CWC), and does not contain significant quantities of decomposable solid waste.

- ss. "Landfill" shall mean the portion of the subject property where Solid Waste is to be permanently placed, compacted, and then buried under daily, interim and Final Cover, all pursuant to applicable requirements of federal, state, and local laws and regulations. No portion of the Landfill shall extend beyond the "Limits of Fill," as defined in this grant, and no allowance for settlement of fill shall be used in determining the final elevations or design contours of the Landfill. "Landfill" does not include temporary storage areas, Final Cover, and Ancillary Facilities authorized by this grant.
- tt. "LEA" shall mean the Los Angeles County Local Enforcement Agency.
- uu. "Limits of Fill" shall mean the horizontal boundaries and vertical boundaries (as identified by contours) of the Landfill, as depicted on the attached Exhibit "A".
- vv. "Liquid waste" shall mean waste as defined in Title 27, Section 20164 of the California Code of Regulations and includes non-hazardous sludge meeting the requirements contained in Title 23, Chapter 15 of the California Code of Regulation for disposal in a Class III Landfill.
- ww. "Materials Recovery Facility" shall mean a facility that separates solid waste into recyclable materials and Residual Waste.
- xx. "MMRP" shall mean Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- yy. "Nuisance" shall mean anything which is injurious to human health or is indecent or offensive to the senses and interferes with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property, and affects at the same time a community, neighborhood, household or any number of persons although the extent of annoyance or damage inflicted upon an individual may be unequal and which occurs as a result of the storage, removal, transport, processing or disposal of solid waste
- zz. "Operating Agreement" shall mean the Operating Agreement between the County through the Department of Public Works and the Permittee for the operation of the Household Hazardous Waste Facility.
- aaa. "Organic Waste" shall mean food waste, green waste and other compostable organic materials, landscape and pruning waste, nonhazardous wood waste, and food-soiled paper waste that is mixed in with food waste, pursuant to AB1826 Chesbro (Chapter 727, Statues of 2014).
- bbb. "Organic Waste Composting Facility" shall mean a facility at which composting is conducted and produces a product resulting from the

controlled biological decomposition of mixed organic wastes that are source separated from the municipal solid waste stream, or which are separated at a centralized facility.

- ccc. "Periodic Review" shall mean the process in which the Technical Advisory Committee and a Hearing Officer or the Regional Planning Commission review the studies submitted by the Permittee and issues a Finding of Fact and potentially approve changes to the IMP.
- ddd. "Permittee" shall include the applicant, owner of property, their successors in interest, and any other person, corporation, or entity making use of this grant.
- eee. "Post-Closure Maintenance" shall mean the activities undertaken at the Facility after the Closure Date to maintain the integrity of the Environmental Protection and Control Systems and the Landfill containment features, and to monitor compliance with applicable performance standards to protect public health, safety, and the environment. The containment features, whether natural or artificially designed and installed, shall be used to prevent and/or restrict the release of waste constituents onto land, into the atmosphere, and/or into the waters of the State of California, including waste constituents mobilized as a component of leachate or landfill gas.
- fff. "Post-Closure Maintenance Period" shall mean the period after Closure of the Landfill when the Solid Waste disposed of during the Landfill's operation could still pose a threat to public health, safety, or the environment.
- ggg. "Post-Closure Maintenance Plan" shall mean the preliminary, partially final, or final plan or plans, as applicable, approved by CalRecycle and concurred by the TAC for implementation of all Post-Closure Maintenance at the Facility.
- hhh. "Project" shall mean the activities of the landfill whose ultimate development is depicted on Exhibit "A" of this grant. The Project includes the landfill, its Ancillary Facilities and activities as approved by this grant, including, but not limited to, waste diversion facilities, household hazard waste facility, organic waste composting facility, offices and other employee facilities, a leachate management facility, material storage areas, and Closure and Post-Closure Maintenance activities.
- iii. "Department of Public Works" shall mean the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; the term "Director of Public Works shall mean the Director of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Work and his or her designees.
- jjj. "Recyclable" shall mean materials that could be used to manufacture a new product.

- kkk. "Residual Waste" shall mean the materials remaining after removal of recyclable materials from the Solid Waste stream.
- III. "RWQCB" shall mean the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region.
- mmm. "Santa Clarita Valley" shall mean the area as defined by the Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 in figure map 5.33, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on October 6, 2015.
- nnn. "SCAQMD" shall mean the South Coast Air Quality Management District.
- ooo. "Sewage Sludge" shall mean any residue, excluding grit or screenings, removed from a wastewater treatment facility or septic tank, whether in a dry, semidry or liquid form.
- ppp. "Sludge" shall mean accumulated solids and/or semisolids deposited from wastewaters or other fluids. Sludge includes materials specified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 27, Division 2, Chapter 3, Article 1, Section 20690(b)(4).
- qqq. "Site Plan" shall mean the plan depicting all or a portion of the subject property, including any Ancillary Facilities approved by the Director of Regional Planning. "Site Plan" shall include what is referred to in this grant as Exhibit "A".
- rrr. "Solid Waste" shall mean all putrescible and non-putrescible solid and semisolid wastes, such as municipal solid waste, garbage, refuse, rubbish, paper, ashes, industrial wastes, demolition and construction wastes, abandoned vehicles and parts thereof, discarded home and industrial appliances, manure, vegetable or animal solid and semi-solid wastes, and other discarded solid and semi-solid wastes. "Solid Waste" excludes Beneficial Use Materials and substances having commercial value which are salvaged for reuse, recycling, or resale. Solid Waste includes Residual Waste received from any source.

Materials that are placed in the Landfill that could be classified as Beneficial Use Materials but exceed the amount that is appropriate for a specific beneficial use in accordance with 14 CCR § 20686, or that exceed the monthly permitted quanties of Beneficial Use Materials, such as Construction and Demolition Debris, Inert Waste and green waste, are considered Solid Waste that is disposed in the Landfill.

- sss. "Stockpile" shall mean temporarily stored materials.
- ttt. "Stockpile Area" shall have the same meaning as "Temporary Storage Area," as defined in this grant.
- uuu. "SWFP" shall mean a Solid Waste Facilities Permit issued by CalRecycle.
- vvv. "SWMP" shall mean Solid Waste Management Program of the Department of Public Health.
- www. "TAC" shall mean the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Technical Advisory Committee established pursuant to Part XIV of the IMP.
- xxx. "Task Force" shall mean the Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/Integrated Waste Management Task Force.
- yyy. "Temporary Storage Area" shall mean an area of the Landfill where materials intended for Beneficial Use, salvage, recycling, or reuse may be placed for storage on a temporary basis, as approved by the Department of Public Works for up to 180 calendar days, unless a longer period is approved by the Department of Public Works, so long as such temporary storage does not constitute Disposal, as defined in this grant. Putrescible materials, except Construction and Demolition Debris or other Inert Debris not containing significant quantities of decomposable materials and more than 1 percent (by visual inspection) putrescible waste, shall not be placed in a Temporary Storage Area for more than 7 calendar days under any circumstances.
- zzz. "Termination Date" shall mean the date upon which the Facility shall cease receiving Solid Waste and/or Beneficial Use Materials for disposal or processing in accordance with Condition No. 36 of this grant.
- aaaa. "Trash" shall have the same meaning as "Solid Waste," as defined in this grant.
- bbbb. "Wasteshed Area" shall mean the Santa Clarita Valley as defined by the Los Angeles County Area Plan, which was updated and adopted by the Board of Supervisors on November 27, 2012.
- cccc. "Working Face" shall mean the working surface of the Landfill upon which Solid Waste is deposited during the Landfill operation prior to the placement of cover material.
- 2. Unless otherwise expressly provided in this grant, applicable federal, state, or local definitions shall apply to the terms used in this grant. Also, whenever a definition or other provision of this grant refers to a particular statute, code, regulation, ordinance, or other regulatory enactment, that definition or other provision shall include, for the life of this grant, any amendments made to the pertinent statute, code, regulation, orde, regulation, ordinance, or other regulatory enactment.
- 3. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the Permittee, and the owner of the subject property (if other than the Permittee), have filed at the office of the Department their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all of

the conditions of this grant, and that the conditions of this grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 8, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 11, 16, 18, and 123. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Condition No. 3 and Condition Nos. 5, 6, 9, and 11 shall be effective immediately upon the Approval Date of this grant by the County. Notwithstanding Condition No. 16 of this grant, the filing of such affidavit constitutes a waiver of the Permittee's right to challenge any provision of this grant.

- 4. The Permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees brought by any third party to attack, set aside, void, or annul this permit approval, or any related discretionary approval, whether legislative or quasi-judicial, which action is brought within the applicable time period of California Government Code Section 65009 or other applicable limitations period. The County shall promptly notify the Permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding, and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the Permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding, or if the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the Permittee shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the County.
- 5. The Permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County for damages resulting from water, air, or soil contamination, health impacts, or loss of property value during the operation, or Closure or Post-Closure Maintenance of the Facility.
- 6. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the Permittee shall within 10 days of the filing make an initial deposit with the Department of \$10,000 from which actual costs and expenses shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the costs or expenses involved in the Department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance provided to the Permittee or the Permittee's counsel.

If during the litigation process, actual costs or expenses incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the Permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of \$10,000. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

At the sole discretion of the Permittee, the amount of an initial or any supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein. Additionally, the cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents shall be paid by the Permittee according to County Code Section 2.170.010.

11

- 7. If any material provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid by court of competent jurisdiction, the permit shall be void, and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
- 8. Prior to the Effective Date of this grant, the Permittee, or the owner of the subject property if other than the Permittee, shall record the terms and conditions of this grant in the office of the County Registrar Recorder/County Clerk ("Recorder"). In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the subject property during the term of this grant, the Permittee or the owner of the subject property if other than the Permittee, shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its terms and conditions to the transferee or lessee of the subject property. Upon recordation, the Permittee shall provide an official copy of the recorded conditions to the Director of Regional Planning.
- 9. This grant shall expire unless it is used within one year from the Approval Date of the grant. A single one-year time extension may be requested in writing and with the payment of the applicable fee prior to such expiration date. This grant shall be considered used upon the receipt of Solid Waste at the Facility and disposal activities any day after Approval Date and Permittee has completed the requirements of Condition No. 3.
- 10. The subject property shall be developed, maintained, and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant, and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the Permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of this grant. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as to ensure that any development undertaken on the subject property is in accordance with the approved site plan on file.

The Permittee shall also comply with the conditions and requirements of all permits or approvals issued by other government agencies or departments, including, but not limited to, the permits or approvals issued by:

- a. The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery ("CalRecycle");
- b. The County LEA/Los Angeles County Department of Public Health ("DPH"), including the DPH letter dated 2/23/17 and all other DPH requirements;
- c. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("Public Works");
- d. The Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/Integrated Waste Management Task Force;
- e. The California Air Resource Board ("CARB");
- f. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board ("CRWQCB");

- g. The South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD");
- h. The California Department of Fish and Game;
- i. The United States Army Corps of Engineers;
- j. The California Department of Health Services;
- k. The Los Angeles County Fire Department, including the requirements in the Fire Department letter dated 2/24/17; Applicant must receive Fire Department clearance of gated entrance design off Wolcott Way and Fuel Modification Plan prior to effective date of the permit, and comply with all other Fire Department requirements; and
- I. The Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

The Permittee shall not engage in activities which may impede the abilities of these agencies and other consultants hired by the County to conduct inspections of the site, whether announced or unscheduled.

- 11. Within five (5) working days of the Approval Date of this grant, the Permittee shall remit processing fees payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination (NOD) for this project and its entitlements in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code. Unless a Certificate of Exemption is issued by the California Department of Fish and Game pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code, the Permittee shall pay the fees in effect at the time of the filing of the NOD, as provided for in Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code, the Permittee shall pay the fees in effect at the time of the NOD, as provided for in Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code, the Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code, the Permittee shall pay the fees in effect at the time of the filing of the NOD, as provided for in Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code, the Permittee shall pay the fees in effect at the time of the filing of the NOD, as provided for in Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code, the Permittee shall pay the fees in effect at the time of the filing of the NOD, as provided for in Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code, the Permittee shall pay the fees in effect at the time of the filing of the NOD, as provided for in Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code, currently \$3,153.25 (\$3,078.25 for an Environmental Impact Report plus \$75.00 processing fee.) No land use project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.
- 12. Upon the Effective Date, the Permittee shall cease all development and other activities that are not in full compliance with Condition No. 10, and the failure to do so shall be a violation of this grant. The Permittee shall keep all required permits in full force and effect and shall fully comply with all requirements thereof. Failure of the Permittee to provide any information requested by County staff regarding any such required permit shall constitute a violation of this grant and shall be subject to any and all penalties described in Condition No. 18.

It is hereby declared to be the intent of this grant that if any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void, and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.

13. To the extent permitted by law, the Department or DPH shall have the authority to order the immediate cessation of landfill operations or other activities at the Facility if the Board, Department or DPH determines that such cessation is necessary for

the health, safety, and/or welfare of the County's residents or the environment. Such cessation shall continue until such time as the Department or DPH determines that the conditions leading to the cessation have been eliminated or reduced to such a level that there no longer exists an unacceptable threat to the health, safety, and/or welfare of the County's residents or the environment.

- 14. The Permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), which are incorporated by this reference as if set forth fully herein.
- 15. The Permittee shall comply with the Implementation and Monitoring Program ("IMP"), which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.
- 16. Within 30 days of the Approval Date, the Permittee shall record a covenant and agreement, which attaches the MMRP and the IMP and agrees to comply with the mitigation measures imposed by the Environmental Impact Report for this project and the provisions of the IMP, in the office of the Recorder. Prior to recordation, the Permittee shall submit a draft copy of the covenant and agreement to the Department for review and approval. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures and IMP measures, the Permittee shall submit annual mitigation monitoring reports to the Department for approval, or as required, with a copy of such reports to the Department of Public Works, the CAC and the TAC. The report shall describe the status of the Permittee's compliance with the required measures. The report shall be due for submittal on July 1st of each year and shall be submitted for review and approval no later than March 30th annually.
- Within 30 days of the Approval Date of this grant, the Permittee 17. shall deposit an initial sum of \$10,000.00 with the Department in order to defray the cost of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the reports required by the MMRP and inspecting the premises to ensure compliance with the MMRP and to undertake any other activity of the Department to ensure that the mitigation measures are satisfied, including, but not limited to, carrying out the following activities: enforcement, permitting, inspections, providing administrative support in the oversight and enforcement of mitigation measures, performing technical studies, and retaining the services of an independent consultant for any of the aforementioned purposes, or for routine monitoring of any and/or all of the mitigation measures. If the actual costs incurred pursuant to this Condition No. 17 (a) have reached 80 percent of the amount of the initial deposit (\$10,000), and the Permittee has been so notified, the Permittee shall deposit supplemental funds to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit (\$10,000) within 10 business days of such notification. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required during the life of this grant. The Permittee shall replenish the mitigation monitoring account if necessary until all mitigation measures have been implemented and completed. Any balance remaining in the mitigation monitoring account upon completion of all measures and completion of the need for further monitoring or review by the

14

Department shall be returned to the Permittee.

18. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor pursuant to Section 22.60.340 of the County Code. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") or a Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing in accordance with Section 22.56.1780, et seq. of the County Code, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or Hearing Officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public's health or safety or so as to be a nuisance, or as otherwise authorized pursuant to Chapter 22.56, Part 13 of the County Code.

In addition to, or in lieu of, the provisions just described, the Permittee shall be subject to a penalty for violating any provision of this grant in an amount determined by the Director of Regional Planning, not to exceed \$1,000 per day per violation. For this purpose, the Permittee shall deposit the sum of \$30,000 in an interest-bearing trust fund with the Department within 30 days after the Effective Date to establish a draw-down account. The Permittee shall be sent a written notice for any such violation with the associated penalty, and if the noticed violation has not been remedied within 30 days from the date of the notice, to the satisfaction of the Director of Regional Planning, the stated penalty, in the written notice shall be deducted from the draw-down account. If the stated violation is corrected within 30 days from the date of the notice, no amount shall be deducted from the draw-down account. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, if the stated violation is corrected within 30 days from the date of the notice but said violation recurs any time within a 6 month period, the stated penalty will be automatically deducted from the draw-down account upon such recurrence and the Permittee will be notified of such deduction. If the deposit is ever depleted by 50 percent of the initial deposit amount (\$15,000), the Permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit (\$30,000) within 10 business days of notification of the depletion. There shall be no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required during the life of this grant. The balance remaining in the drawdown account, including interest, shall be returned to the Permittee upon the Director of Public Works' determination that the Landfill is no longer a threat to public health, safety, and the environment.

If the Permittee is dissatisfied with any notice of violation as described in the preceding paragraph, the Permittee may appeal the notice of violation to the Hearing Officer pursuant to Section 22.60.390(C)(1) of the County Code within 15 days of receipt by the Permittee of the notice of violation. The Hearing Officer shall consider such appeal and shall take one of the following actions regarding the appeal:

a. Affirm the notice of violation;

- b. Rescind the notice of violation; or
- c. Modify the notice of violation.

The decision of the Hearing Officer is final and shall not be subject to further administrative appeal.

- 19. All requirements of Title 22 of the County Code and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless otherwise modified as set forth in these conditions or as shown on the approved Site Plan or Exhibit "A", or on a revised Exhibit "A" approved by the Director of Regional Planning.
- 20. All structures, walls, and fences open to public view shall remain free of graffiti or other extraneous markings, drawings, or signage that was not approved by the Department. These shall include any of the above that do not directly relate to the business being operated at the Facility or that do not provide pertinent information about the Facility. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.

In the event of graffiti or other extraneous markings occurring, the Permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours of notification of such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces.

The Permittee shall also establish and maintain a graffiti deterrent program for approval by the Department of Public Works. An approved copy shall be provided to the Graffiti Abatement Section of the Department of Public Works.

## **PROJECT SPECIFIC CONDITIONS**

#### **GENERAL PROVISIONS**

- 21. Upon the Effective Date, this grant shall supersede Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") 89-081(5) and shall authorize the continued operation of a Class III (non-hazardous) Solid Waste landfill on the subject property. The maximum tonnage capacity to be received at the Facility shall be as follows:
  - a. <u>Average Daily Tonnage Capacity</u> The amount of Solid Waste that may be disposed of in the Landfill shall average 5,000 tons per day, Monday to Saturday, provided the weekly total shall not exceed 30,000 tons in any given week. The overall average daily capacity of all incoming materials received for processing, disposal, and beneficial use at the facility shall not exceed 6,730 tons per day.

- b. <u>Facility Daily Maximum Capacity</u> The maximum tonnage of any combination of Solid Waste and other materials received by the Facility for processing, Beneficial Use Materials (including Composting) and disposal shall not exceed 12,000 tons on any given day, provided the Monthly Tonnage Capacity shall not be exceeded.
- c. <u>Monthly Tonnage Capacity</u> The total quantity of all materials received for processing, disposal, and Beneficial Use Materials at the Facility shall not exceed 175,000 tons in any given month. The amount of Beneficial Use Materials processed and/ or disposed in any given month shall not exceed 58,333 and 1/3 tons.
- d. <u>Composting Facility Capacity</u> The amount of incoming materials for processing at the Organic Waste Composting Facility shall not exceed 560 tons per day. This amount shall also be included in the amount of Beneficial Use Materials allowed.
- e. <u>Facility Annual Maximum Capacity</u> The maximum annual tonnage capacity of all materials received by the Facility for processing.shall not exceed 2,100,000 tons in any calendar year. Of this overall tonnage, Solid Waste disposed may not exceed 1,400,000 tons and Beneficial Use Materials (including Compost) may not exceed 700,000 tons in any calendar year.
- 22. The Board may increase the maximum daily amounts of Solid Waste allowed by Condition No. 21 if, upon the joint recommendation of the DPH and the Department of Public Works, the Board determines that an increase is necessary to appropriately manage the overall County waste stream for the protection of public health and safety, including at the time of a declared disaster or national emergency. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, there shall not be allowed more than 312 total days during the life of this grant where the maximum daily tonnage amount exceeds the limits set forth in Condition No. 21, excluding any days where the tonnage capacity was exceeded due to a declared disaster or national emergency.
- 23. The County reserves the right to exercise its police power to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare of County residents by managing the Countywide waste stream, including preventing predatory pricing. The Permittee shall not adopt waste disposal practices/policies at the Facility which discriminate against self-haulers, waste haulers, and other solid waste enterprises delivering waste originating in the Unincorporated Los Angeles County areas.
- 24. This grant shall also authorize the following Ancillary Facilities and activities at the Facility, as shown on the approved Exhibit "A", subject to the conditions of this grant:

- a. Office and employee facilities directly related to the Landfill, including offices or other facilities related to any other enterprise operated by the Permittee or other person or entity employed by the Permittee or acting on its behalf;
- b. Operations related to the placement and disposal of Solid Waste;
- c. Paint booth for equipment and containers;
- d. Leachate collection and management facilities;
- e. Facilities necessary for the collection, utilization, and distribution of Landfill gases, as required and/or approved by the Department of Public Works, the DPH, or the SCAQMD;
- f. Facilities necessary for the maintenance of machinery and equipment used at the Landfill, excluding Solid Waste collection equipment and vehicles, and equipment or machinery used by the Permittee in other enterprises;
- g. On-site waste diversion and recycling activities consistent in scale and purpose with the agreement entered into pursuant to Condition No. 43 of this grant;
- h. Facilities necessary for Environmental Protection and Control Systems, including flare stations, storage tanks, sedimentation basins, and drainage devices;
- i. Storage and repair of bins utilized for Landfill activities;
- j. Household hazardous waste consolidation area;
- k. Household Hazardous Waste Facility;
- I. Organics Waste Composting Facility;
- m. Landfill Gas-to-Energy Plant; and
- n. Conversion Technology Facility.

In the event that revisions to the approved Site Plan, including the approved Exhibit "A", consistent with the intent of this grant and the scope of the supporting environmental documentation are proposed, such revised Site Plan shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and pre-approval, and to the Director of Regional Planning for final approval, with copies filed with the Department of Public Works and the DPH. For the life of this grant there shall be

no revisions to the approved Exhibit "A" that change the Limits of Fill, and no Site Plan shall be approved that will change the Limits of Fill.

- 25. Household Hazardous Waste Facility and its operations shall be subject to the following use restrictions and pursuant to Condition No. 122 of this grant:
  - a. Household Hazardous Waste Facility may be used by the general public to drop off household hazardous wastes, including, but not limited to, used motor oil, used latex paints, used anti-freeze, and used batteries; and other wastes as may be defined in the Operating Agreement. The Household Hazardous Waste Facility is not to be used for general use by commercial or industrial entities except for Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators, which shall mean a generator that generats no more than 100 kilograms of hazardous waste in any calandar month.
  - b. The Household Hazardous Waste Facility shall be no smaller than 2,500 square feet in size, exclusive of ingress and egress.
  - c. Nothing in this Condition 25 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the Permittee from applying for new permits to expand the Household Hazardous Waste Facility or to otherwise modify the conditions of this grant for that purpose.
  - d. Recyclable materials shall not be collected in quantities or stored for periods which would cause the need for a hazardous waste facilities permit unless such permit has been obtained.
  - e. Operating hours shall be as defined in the Operating Agreement, but in no event shall those hours exceed 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 pm, 7 days per week.
  - f. The Household Hazardous Waste Facility shall be staffed continuously during operating hours by a person(s) trained in hazardous material handling and management.
  - g. Household Hazardous Waste Facility development shall substantially conform to Exhibit "A", any requirements of this grant, and the mitigations listed in the visual impact section of the mitigation monitoring summary reference in the MMRP.
- 26. Permittee may construct and operate an Organic Waste Composting Facility together with certain ancillary and related activities as enumerated herein, subject to the following restrictions as to use:
  - a. The facility may be used to receive process and compost green waste, food waste, and other organics waste materials and to store and distribute mulch, biomass fuel and compost.

- b. The facility location shall be designated on the Site Plan Exhibit "A" or an approved Revised Exhibit "A" prior to beginning operations. The location shall be approved by the Director of Public Works and shall be far away from residential and business areas. The facility shall be enclosed.
- c. The Organic Waste Composting Facility operation shall receive no more than 560 tons per day of green waste, food waste, and other organics waste materials. No wastewater biosolids (e.g. sludge or sludge components) shall be allowed.
- d. Operating hours shall be within the hours of 5 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday to Saturday.
- e. Access by customers for purposes of removing the solid products and byproducts including finished mulch and compost shall not occur outside hours of 5:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday to Saturday.
- f. Permittee shall comply with all rules for odor abatement and prevention of the South Coast Air Quality Management District and the DPH. The Permittee shall not allow odors to become a nuisance in adjacent residential and business areas. In the event odors become a nuisance in adjacent residential and business areas, Permittee shall take all necessary steps to abate that nuisance. If the Permittee, despite the application of the best available technology and methodology, cannot abate the nuisance odors resulting from Organic Waste Composting Facility operations, the Permittee shall terminate such operations.
- g. Upon commencement date of the Organic Waste Composting Facility, the Permittee shall submit to the Department of Public Works, DPH-SWMP, and SCAQMD an Odor Control and Mitigation Plan for operation of the this facility.
- 27. The Final Cover of the Landfill shall not exceed the permitted elevation of 1,430 feet above mean sea level, and the Footprint shall not exceed the total permitted disposal area of 400 acres. No portion of the Landfill shall extend beyond the Limits of Fill as shown on the approved Exhibit "A." The existing Landfill consists of the following as shown on the approved Exhibit "A": existing Primary Canyon currently (55 acres, completely filled); existing Canyon B (14 acres, currently completely filled); existing Main Canyon (188 acres, currently 182 acres have been filled); and new fill areas (143 acres currently unfilled), together with certain ancillary and related activities, as enumerated herein, subject to the restrictions contained in this grant.
- 28. The Permittee shall not sever, sell, or convey any portion or the entirety of property for which this CUP is granted without first notifying the Department, with

a copy to the Department of Public Works, at least 90 days in advance. Any future receiver of the subject property shall be required to acknowledge and accept all conditions of this grant prior to finalization of any conveyance.

- 29. The Permittee shall keep all required permits in full force and effect, and shall fully comply with all requirements thereof. Failure of the Permittee to provide any information requested by County staff regarding any such required permit shall constitute a violation of this grant, and shall be subject to any and all penalties described in Condition No. 18.
- 30. Nothing in these conditions shall be construed to require the Permittee to engage in any act that is in violation of any state or federal statute or regulation.
- 31. The Permittee shall reimburse DPH for personnel, transportation, equipment, and facility costs incurred in carrying out inspection duties as set forth in the SWMP, including maintaining at least one full time inspector at the Facility at least once a week when waste is received and processed to the extent that these costs are not covered by the fees already paid for administration of the SWFP for the Landfill.

### **INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS**

- 32. Prior to the Effective Date, and thereafter on an annual basis, the Permittee shall provide evidence of insurance coverage to the Department of Public Works in the amount of at least \$40 million that meets County requirements and that satisfies all the requirements set forth in this Condition No. 32. Such coverage shall be maintained throughout the term of this grant and until such time as all Post-Closure Maintenance requirements are met by the Permittee and certified by the appropriate local, state and federal agencies. Such insurance coverage shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following: general liability, automobile liability and pollution liability, and clean-up cost insurance coverage with, an endorsement for "Sudden and Accidental" contamination or pollution. Such coverage shall be in an amount sufficient to meet all applicable state, federal, and local requirements, with no special limitations. Upon certification of coverage, and annually thereafter, a copy of such certification shall be provided to the Department of Public Works.
- 33. To ensure that the Permittee has sufficient funds at Closure to provide for the continued payment of insurance premiums for the period described in Condition No. 32 of this grant, the Permittee shall, within 60 months prior to the anticipated Closure Date, and annually thereafter, provide financial assurance satisfactory to the Department of Public Works that meets County requirements as approved by the CEO showing its ability to maintain all insurance coverage and indemnification requirements of Condition Nos. 32 and 34 of this grant. Such financial assurance shall be in the form of a trust fund or other financial instrument acceptable to the County. the Department of Public Works shall

administer the trust fund, and all interest earned or accrued by the fund shall remain in the fund to keep pace with the cost of inflation.

To ensure that the Permittee has sufficient funds for the Landfill's Closure 34. and/or the Post-Closure Maintenance and maintenance of the Environmental Protection and Control System, the Permittee shall, within 60 months of the anticipated Closure Date, and annually thereafter, provide financial assurance satisfactory to the Department of Public Works that meets County requirements as approved by the CEO that it is financially able to carry out these functions in perpetuity or until the Landfill no longer is a threat to public health and safety as determined by the Department of Public Works. The Department of Public Works' determination shall be based on an engineering study prepared by an independent consultant selected by the Department of Public Works. The Permittee shall pay all costs associated with the independent consultant and the study within 30 days of receiving the invoice for the consultant's services. Such financial assurance shall be in the form of a trust fund or other financial instrument acceptable to the Department of Public Works. Permittee shall pay into the fund annually and the Department of Public Works shall administer the fund, and all interest earned or accrued by the fund shall remain in the fund to keep pace with the cost of inflation. The Department of Public Works may consider, at its sole discretion, the financial assurance mechanism required under State law and regulation in meeting the intent of this Condition No. 34.

#### **PERIODIC REVIEW**

35. Not less than one year before the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the effective date of this grant, the Permittee shall initiate a Periodic Review with the Department. Another Periodic Review shall be initiated by the Permittee not less than one year before the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the effective date of this grant. The purpose of the Periodic Reviews is to consider new or changed circumstances, such as physical development near the Project Site, improved technological innovations in environmental protection and control systems, and other best management practices that might significantly improve the operations of the Facility, and to determine if any changes to the facility operations and IMP are warranted based on the changed circumstances. To initiate the Periodic Review the Permittee shall submit for review a permit requirement compliance study which details the status of the Permittee's compliance with the conditions of approval of this grant. Additionally, an updated Closure Plan and Post-Closure Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to the Department and the TAC for review at this time, as well as the comprehensive waste disposal study referred to in Condition No. 103, and any other information that is deemed necessary by the Department to ensure that the landfill operations are operating as efficiently and effectively as possible and that any potential adverse impacts are minimized, and that the Facility is not causing adverse impacts or nuisance in the surrounding communities.

The cost of the Periodic Reviews shall be borne by the Permittee and is to be

paid through the draw-down account referred to in Condition No. 123a. For each Periodic Review, a report based on the latest information shall be made to the Hearing Officer by Department staff at a public hearing pursuant to Part 4 of Chapter 22.60 of the County Code. Each report shall include a review of the performance of the landfill and recommendations for any actions to be taken if found necessary. Such actions may include changes or modifications to the IMP, including any measures necessary to ensure that the landfill will continue to operate in a safe and effective manner and the landfill closure will be accomplished timely and effectively. The decision of the Hearing Officer on the Periodic Review may be appealed to the Regional Planning Commission. The decision of the Regional Planning Commission shall be final.

## **TERMINATION REQUIREMENTS**

- 36. The maximum life of this grant shall be 30 years, effective from the Approval Date. The Termination Date shall be either date that 1) the Landfill reaches its Limits of Fill as depicted on Exhibit "A" (Elevation 1,430 feet Alternative), or 2) 60 million tons, or 3) 30 years after the Approval Date of this grant, whichever occurs first. At least twelve (12) months prior to the 25th anniversary of the Approval Date, if the Permittee has not exhausted the available Landfill capacity within the Limits of Fill depicted on Exhibit "A", the Permittee shall conduct a study to determine the remaining capacity of the Landfill and identify all activities and schedules required for the Closure and Post-Closure maintenance of the Facility. The study shall be submitted to the TAC for its independent review and upon its review, the TAC shall report to the Director of Regional Planning its finding regarding the remaining capacity of the Landfill and the Termination Date. Upon consideration of the TAC's finding, the Director of Regional Planning shall establish a certain Termination Date for the Landfill, but in no event shall the Termination Date be a date that is later than 30 years after the Approval Date.
- 37. Upon the Termination Date, the Facility shall no longer receive Solid Waste and/or Beneficial Use Materials for disposal or processing; however, the Permittee shall be authorized to continue operation of any and all facilities of the Landfill as are necessary to complete: (1) the mitigation measures required by this grant; (2) the Closure and Post-Closure Maintenance required by federal, state, and local agencies; and (3) all monitoring and maintenance of the Environmental Protection and Control Systems required by Condition No. 86. No later than 6 months after the Termination Date, all Landfill facilities not required for the above-mentioned functions shall be removed from the subject property unless they are allowed as a matter of right by the zoning regulations then in effect.

## **OPERATING HOURS**

38. The Facility shall be subject to the following operating hours:

23

- a. The Facility may receive Solid Waste and Beneficial Use Materials only between the hours of 5 a.m. (scales open) to 5 p.m. (scales closed). The Facility entrance gate may be open at 5 a.m., Monday through Saturday, to allow on-site queuing only and preparations of the Facility for operations. However, the gate opening hours may be extended to 4 a.m. by the Director of Public Works, at his sole discretion, if the Permittee submits and if the Department of Public Works approves an Operational Assessment Plan for special construction projects showing a reduction in traffic, noise and visual impacts from a modification of the hours. At any given time, no offsite queuing shall be allowed.
- b. The Facility and all of its operations shall be closed on Sundays.
- c. Facility operations, such as site preparation and maintenance activities, waste processing, and the application of cover, may be conducted only between the hours of 5 a.m. and 10 p.m., Monday through Saturday. This operating restriction shall not apply to Facility activities that require continuous operation, such as gas control.
- d. Equipment maintenance activities at the Facility may be conducted only between the hours of 5 a.m. and 10 p.m., Monday through Saturday.
- e. No diesel vehicle shall be started at the Facility between the hours of 10 p.m. and 5 a.m.
- f. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Condition No. 38, emergency operations, mitigation measures necessary to avoid adverse environmental impacts, and equipment repairs, which cannot be accomplished within the hours set forth in this Condition No. 38, may occur at any time if approved via written electronic authorization by the DPH. A copy of this authorization shall be provided to the Director of Regional Planning.
- g. Notwithstanding the forgoing, Solid Waste and Beneficial Use Materials may be received at other times than those just described, except on Sundays, if the DPH determines that extended hours are necessary for the preservation of public health and safety.

## MAXIMIZING FACILITY CAPACITY

39. The Permittee shall prepare fill sequencing plans for Landfill operations to maximize Landfill capacity, and such plans must be technically, environmentally, and economically feasible. The Permittee shall submit fill sequencing plans to the Department of Public Works for review and approval within 90 days after the Effective Date so that the Department of Public Works can verify that the plans have been properly prepared and adequately reflect the amount of material that will be placed in the Landfill. Any subsequent changes to the approved

sequencing plans must be approved by the Department of Public Works prior to implementation. The plans approved by the Department of Public Works shall not be in conflict with those contained in the latest State-approved Joint Technical Document for the Facility.

40. Within 180 days after the Effective Date, or a longer period if approved by the Department of Public Works, the Permittee shall adopt and implement appropriate measures to ensure that the method to determine that the waste origin and the amount of Solid Waste received, processed and/or disposed at the facility is accurate. The permittee shall comply with this condition and Part IV of the IMP.

The waste origin and reporting program shall be developed by the Permittee for review and approval by Public Works. The Permittee shall submit the data from this program on a monthly basis to Public Works for review or at other frequency as determined by the Director of Public Works. Based on the initial results from this program, Public Works may require the Permittee to modify the program or to develop or implement additional monitoring or enforcement programs to ensure that the intent of this Condition No. 40 is satisfied.

The Waste origin and reporting program shall include all incoming solid waste, beneficial use materials, composting materials, clean soil used for daily and intermediate cover, and any other material coming to the Facility.

- 41. The Permittee shall operate the Facility in a manner that maximizes the amount of Solid Waste that can be disposed of in the Landfill, by, at a minimum:
  - a. Implementing waste compaction methods to equal or exceed the compaction rates of comparable privately-operated landfills in Los Angeles County;
  - Investigating and implementing methods to divert or reduce intake of high volume, low-density materials that are incapable of being readily compacted;
  - c. Investigating and implementing methods to reduce the volume of daily cover required at the Landfill as allowed by the appropriate regulatory agencies;
  - d. Utilizing waste materials received and processed at the Facility as an alternative to daily intermediate, and Final Cover, to the extent such usage is deemed technically feasible and proper by the appropriate regulatory agencies. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, green waste, automobile shredder waste, cement kiln dust, dredge spoils, foundry sands, processed exploration waste from oil wells and contaminated sites, production waste, shredded tires, and foam shall not

25

be used as daily, intermediate, or Final Cover at the Landfill;

- e. To the extent economically and practically feasible, Construction and Demolition Debris shall not be disposed, but rather be separated, and recycled and/or made available for reuse, consistent with the goals of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989;
- f. Investigating and implementing methods to recycle manure; and
- g. All Solid Waste accepted at the Facility that originates from outside the Santa Clarita Valley, including the metropolitan area of Los Angeles County, must be pre-processed or undergo front-end recovery methods to remove all Beneficial Use Materials and Construction and Demolition Debris from the waste stream prior to transport to the Facility to the maximum extent practicable, as determined by the Department of Public Works. As part of its annual report to the TAC required by the IMP, the Permittee shall submit documentation detailing the results of this requirement. The report must at a minimum include the types, quantity, and amount of all Beneficial Use Materials and Construction and Demolition Debris recovered from the waste stream. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Solid Waste originating from residential areas with a 3-bin curbside collection system is exempt from this requirement.
- 42. To the extent feasible, the Permittee shall minimize the disposal of Solid Waste into the Landfill that is required to be diverted or recycled under the County's Source Reduction and Recycling Element of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, adopted pursuant to Division 30 of the California Public Resources Code, and/or the Waste Plan Conformance Agreement, approved by the Board on November 21, 2000, as these documents and agreements may be amended.
- 43. Within 180 days after the Effective Date, and thereafter as is necessary, the Waste Plan Conformance Agreement referred to in Condition No. 42 shall be amended and approved to be consistent with applicable County waste management plans. The Director of Public Works shall be authorized to execute all amendments to the Waste Plan Conformance Agreement on behalf of the County. This Agreement shall continue to provide for: (1) the control of and accounting for all the Solid Waste, and Beneficial Use Material and Composting Materials entering into, and for recycled or diverted material leaving, the Facility; (2) the implementation and enforcement of programs intended to maximize the utilization of available fill capacity as set forth in Condition No. 41; and (3) the implementation of waste diversion and recycling programs in accordance with applicable County waste management plans.

- 44. Within 180 days after the Effective Date, or a longer period if approved by the Department of Public Works, the Permittee shall adopt a program to assist the County in its diversion efforts, including:
  - a. Utilizing alternative daily cover at the Landfill, to the extent permitted by the appropriate regulatory agencies.
  - b. Using a portion of the Facility to transfer loads of commingled recyclables to sorting facilities.
  - c. To the extent feasible, recovering scrap metal and other materials from loads of waste received at the Facility.
  - d. To the extent feasible, recovering and recylcling Construction and Demolition Debris received at the Facility to be placed into the economic mainstreatm and/or reusing it at the Facility to the extent that it is appropriate for the specific use and in accordance with engineering, industry guidelines, or other standard practices in accordance with 14 CCR § 20686.
  - e. Composting shredded wood waste and organics at the Landfill including but not limited to Anaerobic Digestion Composting, provided such composting project is approved by the Department of Public Works and is consistent with the intent of this permit.
  - f. Stockpiling and grinding of wood/green material for use as mulch, boiler fuel, or feedstock for an alternative energy project, provided such energy project is approved by the Department of Public Works and is consistent with the intent of this permit.
  - g. Stockpiling and grinding of concrete/asphalt material for use as base, road material, and/or decking material.
  - h. Development of Conversion Technologies to divert waste from disposal provided such Conversion Technology project is approved by the Department of Public Works and is consistent with the intent of this permit.
  - i. Consolidation of electronic waste such as computers, televisions, VCRs, stereos, copiers, and fax machines.
  - j. Consolidation of white goods such as referigerators, stoves, ovens, and other white-coated major appliances.
  - k. Implementing a comprehensive public awareness and education program informing Santa Clarita Valley residents of the Facility's recycling activities/programs. The program must be submitted to the Department of

Public Works for review and approval within 90 days after the Effective Date.

45. The Permittee shall discourage haulers from delivering partial truck loads to the Facility, and from delivering trucks to the Facility during peak commuting hours; higher tipping fees for such behavior is recommended. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, in lieu of charging higher tipping fees, the Permittee may implement some other program, as approved by the Department of Public Works, to discourage this type of activity by its customers.

### PROHIBITED MATERIALS

- 46. The following types of waste shall constitute prohibited waste and shall not be received, processed nor disposed of at the Facility: Automobile Shredder Waste; Biosolid; Sludge, or Sewage Sludge; incinerator ash; radioactive material; hazardous waste, as defined in Title 22, Section 66261.3 of the California Code of Regulations; medical waste, as defined in Section 117690 of the California Health & Safety Code; liquid waste; waste that contains soluble pollutants in concentrations that exceed applicable water quality objectives; and waste that can cause degradation of waters in the State, as determined by the RWQCB. The Permittee shall implement a comprehensive Waste Load Checking Program, approved by the DPH, to preclude disposal of prohibited waste at the Landfill. The program shall comply with this Condition No. 46, Part IV of the IMP, and any other requirements of the DPH, the State Department of Health Services, the State Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the RWQCB.
- 47. Notices regarding the disposal restrictions of prohibited waste at the Facility and the procedures for dealing with prohibited waste shall be provided to waste haulers and private users on a routine basis. These notices shall be printed in English and Spanish and shall be posted at prominent locations at the Facility indicating that anyone intentionally or negligently bringing prohibited waste to the Facility may be prosecuted to the fullest extent allowed by law.
- 48. In the event that material suspected or known to be prohibited waste is discovered at the Facility, the Permittee shall:
  - a. Obtain driver's name, company name, address, and any other information as appropriate, and vehicle license number;
  - b. Immediately notify all appropriate state and County agencies, as required by federal, state, and local law and regulations;
  - c. If Permittee discovers that such prohibited material has been accepted at the Facilityand after further review it is determined that it cannot immediately be removed by a licensed hauler, Permittee shall store the material at an appropriate site approved by the DPH and the RWQCB

until it is disposed of in accordance with applicable state and local regulations; and

- d. Maintain a record of the prohibited waste to be part of the Permittee's annual report required under the IMP, and to include, at a minimum, the following information:
  - i. A description, nature, and quantity of the prohibited waste;
  - ii. The name and address of the source of the prohibited waste, if known;
  - iii. The quantity of total prohibited waste involved;
  - iv. The specific handling procedures used; and
  - v. A certification of the authenticity of the information provided.

Nothing in this Condition No. 48 shall be construed to permit the Permittee to operate the Facility in any way so as to constitute a Hazardous Waste Disposal Facility, as defined under state law.

## GRADING/DRAINAGE

- 49. Except as otherwise provided in this Condition No. 49, areas outside of the Limits of Fill shall not be graded or similarly disturbed to create additional Landfill area, except that additional grading may be approved by the Department of Public Works if the Department of Public Works determines, based on engineering studies provided by the Permittee and independently evaluated by the Department of Public Works, that such additional grading or disturbance is necessary for slope stability or drainage purposes. Such a determination by the Department of Public Works shall be documented in accordance with Part I of the IMP, and the Permittee shall submit a revised Site Plan for review and approval by the Department of Public Works to show the additional grading and/or disturbance. A copy of the approved revised Site Plan shall be filed with the Director of Regional Planning, the Department of Public Works, and DPH. For the life of this grant, there shall be no revisions to the approved Exhibit "A", that will change the Limits of Fill, and no Site Plan shall be approved that will change the Limits of Fill.
- 50. Nothing in this grant shall be construed as prohibiting the installation of water tanks, access roads, flares, or other similar facilities at the Facility, or implementing any mitigation program, that is required by this grant or by any other permit issued by a public agency in connection with the Landfill.
- 51. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this grant, no approval shall be granted to the Permittee that will modify the authorized Limits of Fill or that will

lower or significantly modify any of the ridgelines surrounding the Landfill.

- 52. The Permittee shall comply with all grading requirements of the Department of Public Works and the County Code. In addition to any other requirements that may apply, the Permittee shall obtain prior approval from the Department of Public Works for all grading that is outside the Landfill footprint and all grading within the Landfill footprint that could impact off-site property as determined by the Department of Public Works, including, but not limited to, grading in connection with cell development, stockpiling, or excavation for borrow and cover materials.
- 53. The Permittee shall install and/or maintain appropriate drainage structures at the Facility to comply with all drainage requirements of the Department of Public Works, the RWQCB, and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Except as otherwise specifically provided by the Department of Public Works, all drainage structures, including sedimentation basins, shall be designed and constructed to meet all applicable drainage and grading requirements of the Department of Public Works, and all design and construction plans for these structures must have prior approval from the Department of Public Works. Notwithstanding the foregoing, at the discretion of the Department of Public Works, the Permittee may be permitted to install temporary drainage structures designed for day-to-day Facility operations without prior approval from the Department of Public Works. In all cases, the Landfill and its drainage structures shall be designed so as to cause surface water to be diverted away from disposal areas. All design modifications shall have the prior approval from the Department of Public Works.
- 54. All development structures and activities pursuant to this grant shall conform to the requirements of the Department of Public Works.

## **GROUNDWATER PROTECTION**

- 55. The Permittee shall install and maintain containment (liner) systems and leachate collection and removal systems as required by the RWQCB. The design of Landfill liners shall be as approved by the RWQCB.
- 56. The Permittee shall install and test any and all groundwater monitoring wells that are required by the RWQCB and shall promptly undertake any action directed by the RWQCB to prevent or correct potential or actual contamination that may affect groundwater quality, or water conveyance or water storage facilities. All testing and remedial actions required by the RWQCB to detect, prevent, and/or correct groundwater contamination shall be completed or guaranteed to be completed to the satisfaction of the RWQCB with notice to the Department of Public Works.
- 57. During the duration of this grant, the project shall use recycled water once a

recycled water pipeline is extend to the Newhall Ranch residential development. The Permittee shall obtain the necessary permits to connect to such recycled water, construct any necessary access, and connect to the piped recycled water.

58. In the event groundwater use is restricted in the future pursuant to Court Order or Judgment, the Permittee shall purchase water from County-authorized water purveyors, including County-authorized recycled water purveyors for nonpotable uses, or authorized State Water Project contractors, and shall otherwise conform to the rules, regulations, and restrictions set forth in any applicable Court Order or Judgment, including those rules, regulations, and restrictions that would require the Permittee to pay assessments, if any.

### LANDSCAPING, COVER AND REVEGETATION AND AESTHETIC REQUIREMENTS

- 59. The Permittee shall comply with the following landscaping, cover and revegetation requirements at the Landfill:
  - a. Three copies of a landscape plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Director of Regional Planning within 180 days after the Effective Date. The landscape plan shall show size, type, and location of all plants, trees, and watering facilities required as a condition of this grant. All landscaping shall be maintained in a neat, clean, and healthful condition in accordance with the approved landscape plan, including proper pruning, weeding, removal of litter, fertilizing, and replacement of plants and trees when necessary but not to exceed quarterly (3 monthsperiod).
  - b. An annual monitoring report shall be prepared by an independent, qualified biologist and submitted to the Director of Regional Planning providing status and progress of the provisions in this Condition No. 59. The monitoring report shall be submitted as part of the annual report required pursuant to Part VIII of the IMP.
  - c. The Permittee shall employ an expert or experts, including an independent, qualified biologist, to satisfy this Condition No. 59. Soil sampling and laboratory analysis shall be conducted in all areas that are required to be re-vegetated before any re-vegetation occurs to identify chemical or physical soil properties that may adversely affect plant growth or establishment. Soil amendments and fertilizer recommendations shall be applied and plant materials selected, based on the above-referenced testing procedures and results. To the extent possible, as determined by the Director of Regional Planning, plant types shall blend with species indigenous to the area, be drought tolerant, and be capable of successful growth.
  - d. The Permittee shall apply a temporary vegetation cover on any

slope or other Landfill area that is projected to be inactive for a period greater than 180 days, as set forth in the IMP. The Permittee shall identify such slope or areas in the annual monitoring report described in Subsection (b) above, and include an interim reclamation and revegetation plan as well as the timing of the proposed work for review and approval by the Director of Regional Planning.

- e. Except as otherwise provided in this Condition No. 59, all final fill slopes shall be reclaimed and re-vegetated in lifts substantially in conformance with Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- f. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Condition No. 59, Permittee shall comply with a different re-vegetation design or plan that the Department, in consultation with the TAC and the Department of Public Works, determines would:
  - i. better protect public health and safety;
  - ii. enable re-vegetation of the final slopes at least as well as described in Subsection (e), above; and/or
  - iii. be required because the minimum standards adopted by the CalRecycle have been amended.

Requirements imposed by the Department pursuant to this Condition 59 must be consistent with State regulations and may not cause the activities at the Landfill to exceed the Limits of Fill.

- g. The Permittee shall provide and maintain a landscape strip that is a minimum of 10 feet wide along the frontage of the ancillary facilities area on Wolcott Way and along SR-126 Highway.
- h. No portion of the expanded Landfill may extend above the plane or outside of the surface area of the fill design as shown on the approved site plan, attached as Exhibit "A".

The existing viewshed from Chiquito Canyon Road shall be protected for the life of the project. The dip in the natural ridgeline along the western boundary shall be maintained or enhanced. Any structure placed on the landfill site, including but not limited to temporary storage areas, any materials recovery facility, composting facility or any other ancillary facilities that may be visible from Chiquito Canyon Road shall be designed to be harmonious with the natural topography and viewshed and shall be reviewed by the Community Advisory Committee.

The landfill operator and the Community Advisory Committee shall work

together to prepare a tree planting and maintenance plan for the entire western boundary of the site. The objectives of the plan are to screen landfill operations, enhance the viewshed, and establish the minimum number and type of trees to do this and to provide adequate access to monitoring wells. Trees may be planted on slopes on either side of the ridgeline provided the above objectives are met and such planting is practical.

- 60. The Permittee shall operate the Facility so as to conserve water by, at a minimum, adopting the following measures:
  - a. Ensuring that all water wells used for the Facility draw from the local watershed, if such usage is approved by the appropriate agencies;
  - b. Investigating the feasibility of treating collected leachate on-site for reuse in the Landfill and, if feasible and the appropriate agencies approve, implementing a program to use such water;
  - c. Using soil sealant, pavement, and/or other control measures for dust control wherever feasible, instead of water; and
  - d. Using drought-tolerant plants to re-vegetate the Landfill slopes and other disturbed areas to the extent feasible, as determined by the Director of Regional Planning. Plant types shall blend with species indigenous to the area and shall be capable of rapid growth.

## **AIR QUALITY**

- 61. As required by the SCAQMD, the Permittee shall adopt and implement operational practices to mitigate air quality impacts including but not limited to odor, dust and vehicular air quality impacts at the Facility. The Facility shall be operated so as not to create a nuisance in the surrounding communities.
- 62. The Permittee shall use landfill gas for energy generation at the Facility or other beneficial uses, rather than flaring to the extent feasible, and shall obtain all applicable local, state, and/or federal approvals for any such use.
- 63. The Permittee shall also install and maintain a landfill gas collection and management system that complies with SCAQMD requirements and uses best available control technology to prevent 1) the lateral migration of gases to off-site properties, and 2) odor generation that causes impact to surrounding communities, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works, the DPH, and SCAQMD.
- 64. Landfill gas flares shall be installed in a manner that does not result in any significant adverse aesthetic impacts and the flames shall be totally contained

within the stacks. Flame arrestors shall be provided to the satisfaction of the County Fire Department.

- 65. The Permittee shall provide access to a back-up generator for emergency use within 48 hours in case of a prolonged power outage at the Facility to prevent the migration/emission of landfill gas, unless such a use is otherwise prohibited by SCAQMD due to air quality concerns.
- 66. The Permittee shall conduct air quality monitoring at the Facility and its surrounding areas. In addition, an independent air quality consultant selected by the TAC shall conduct at least four random tests per year of Landfill dust and diesel particulates surrounding the perimeter of the Facility to determine whether air quality near the Landfill is consistent with the air quality levels established by the operative air quality standards for the area as determined by the SCAQMD or other appropriate State air quality agency. The consultant review shall place added emphasis on the nearby residential communities. The cost of the consultant and the tests shall be borne entirely by the Permittee. The consultant report shall be provided to the Director of Regional Planning, the Department of Public Works, the TAC and the Permittee within 15 calendar days after completion of the tests.
- 67. Upon receipt of a total of 4 Notice of Violations related to air quality issued by any combination of SCAQMD, DPH, the Department of Public Works, or the Department in any given calendar year, the Permittee shall submit a response to the Department of Public Works within 30 calendar days of the fourth such Notice of Violation providing an explanation of each Notice of Violation and steps taken to address it, and shall provide this information within 30 calendar days of each additional Notice of Violation within the same year. the Department of Public Works shall evaluate the response and may require the Permittee to thereafter increase the air quality monitoring that it conducts at the Facility and its surrounding areas. In addition, the TAC may select an independent air quality consultant to evaluate and conduct testing of 1) landfill gas and trash odor generated due to working face operations, 2) landfill gas collection and management system, and 3) dust and diesel particulates surrounding the perimeter of the Facility, at a frequency to be determined by the Department of Public Works in consultation with the air quality consultant. The cost of the consultant and the tests shall be borne entirely by the Permittee. The consultant report shall be provided to the Department of Public Works, the TAC, and the Permittee within 15 calendar days after completion of the tests. The Department of Public Works, with the advice of the TAC, may reduce the frequency of the consultant testing if the Department of Public Works finds that the frequency of testing is not necessary, or may discontinue it altogether if it finds that the tests are not beneficial. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Director of Regional Planning, with the advice of the TAC, may increase the frequency of the consultant testing if the Director of Regional Planning finds the frequency insufficient and may request an evaluation report and recommendations. Upon

34

direction from the Department of Public Works, the Permittee shall implement the recommendations of the independent consultant.

- 68. If any of the test results of Condition No. 66 and/or 67 exceed the maximum emission levels established by the EIR and/or the SCAQMD, if the Landfill is operated in a manner which, in the determination of DPH, creates an odor nuisance to the surrounding communities, or if the Department of Public Works, in consultation with the TAC, determines that additional corrective measures are necessary to address air quality impacts to the residents of the surrounding community, the Permittee shall submit a corrective action plan to the TAC within 15 days after receipt of the report. Such corrective action plan shall describe the excessive emission levels, or the determination by DPH or the Department of Public Works, and set forth a schedule for remedial action. The TAC shall consider the corrective action plan within 30 calendar days of its receipt and provide notice to the Permittee if such plan has been approved. If the TAC does not approve the corrective action plan, the Director of Regional Planning may impose additional or different measures to reduce air quality impacts at the Facility. These additional measures may include, but not be limited to, requirements that the Permittee: (1) pave additional unpaved roads at the Facility; (2) water and apply soil sealant to additional Working Face areas; (3) relocate Working Face areas to designated locations during windy conditions; (4) monitor sensitive sites throughout the community; and/or (5) close the Facility during extreme wind conditions; 6) employ the services of an independent consultant to evaluate the air quality impacts and;/or odor nuisance and make recommendations to mitigate the impacts and/or abate the odor nuisance. The cost of the consultant and the tests shall be borne entirely by the Permittee. The consultant report shall be provided to the Department, the Department of Public Works, the TAC, and the Permittee within 15 calendar days after completion of the tests. The Director of Public Works, with the advice of the TAC, may reduce the frequency of the consultant testing, or discontinue it altogether, if the Director of Public Works finds that the test results are invalid or lack beneficial value. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Director of Regional Planning, with the advice of the TAC, may increase the frequency of the consultant testing if the Director of Regional Planning finds the frequency insufficient. The Permittee may appeal the Director of Regional Planning's decision in accordance with the appeal provisions in Condition No. 18 for an appeal of a notice of violation.
- 69. Within 180 days after the Effective Date, all equipment, diesel fleet vehicles, and transfer trucks that are owned or operated by the Permittee, its subsidiaries, or affiliated enterprises, and that utilize the Facility, shall be CARB compliant.

As part of its annual report to the TAC required by the IMP, the Permittee shall submit documentation of its compliance with this Condition No. 69, including, but not limited to, Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Section 2020, et seq. regarding Diesel Particulate Matter Control Measures.

- 70. Permittee shall be subject to the following requirements regarding alternative fuel vehicles and equipment:
  - a. For the purpose of complying with this Condition No. 70 alternative fuel vehicles shall utilize alternative fuels that are consistent with recommendations or regulations of CARB and SCAQMD, which may include, but is not limited to electricity, natural gas (liquefied natural gas or compressed natural gas), biogas, biodiesel, synthetic diesel, or renewable diesel.
  - b. Within the first year after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall submit an alternative fuel vehicle implementation plan to the TAC for review and approval. The plan shall contain information on available and proposed alternative fuel technologies, a comparison of their air emissions reduction levels at the Facility, including greenhouse gas emissions, a timeline demonstrating the Permittee's best-faith efforts to comply with this Condition No. 70, as well as any other information deemed necessary by the TAC to approve the plan.
  - c. The Permittee shall convert into alternative fuel vehicles all light-duty vehicles operating at the Facility, solid waste collection trucks, and transfer trucks that utilize the Facility and are owned by, operated by, or under contract with the Permittee, its subsidiaries, or affiliated enterprises, according to the following phase-in schedule:
    - i. Within 4 years after the Effective Date, at least 50 percent of all aforementioned vehicles shall be alternative fuel vehicles.
    - ii. Within 7 years after the Effective Date, at least 75 percent of all aforementioned vehicles shall be alternative fuel vehicles.
    - iii. Within 10 years after the Effective Date, 100 percent of all aforementioned vehicles shall be alternative fuel vehicles.
  - d. Within the first year after the Effective Date, unless a later date is approved by the TAC, the Permittee shall consult with the SCAQMD and design and implement at least 1 heavy-duty, alternative fuel off-road equipment pilot program, to the extent deemed technically and economically feasible by the TAC. The pilot program shall be certified by a major original equipment manufacturer such as, but not limited to, Caterpillar, John Deere, or Volvo.
  - e. As part of its annual report to the TAC required by the IMP, the Permittee shall submit an on-going evaluation of its compliance with each component of this Condition No. 70.

- 71. Within 180 day of the effective date, the Permittee shall adopt and implement a fugitive dust program that uses the most effective available methods and technology to avert fugitive dust emissions. The fugitive dust program shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. In addition to the re-vegetation measures in Condition No. 59, the program shall include, at a minimum, a requirement that:
  - a. The Permittee shall not engage in any excavation, grading, or other Landfill activity during high wind conditions, or when high wind conditions are reasonably expected to occur, as determined by the DPH, where such excavation or operation will result in significant emissions of fugitive dust affecting areas not under the Permittee's control;
  - b. The Working Face areas of the Landfill shall be limited to small contained areas of approximately one acre or less. During periods of the year when high wind conditions may be expected, the Working Face areas shall each be located in an area of minimal wind exposure, or be closed, if closure is deemed necessary by the DPH;
  - c. Except when there is sufficient rain or moisture to prevent dust, daily cover, haul roads, and grading locations shall be watered as required by State Minimum Standards or more frequently, when conditions dictate for dust control. Soil sealant may be required in addition to water;
  - d. Except when there is sufficient rain or moisture to prevent dust, all active Working Face and soil Stockpile Areas shall be watered daily, unless wind conditions dictate otherwise;
  - e. If determined necessary by the DPH, the Permittee shall, on any day preceding a day when the Facility is closed to Solid Waste receipt, apply soil sealant to any previously active Working Face, haul roads, or soil Stockpile Area that has not already been sealed or re-vegetated;
  - f. Inactive areas of exposed dirt that have been sealed shall be regularly monitored to determine the need for additional sealing and to prevent unauthorized access that might disturb the sealant. If additional sealing treatment is required, the Permittee shall promptly apply such treatment to assure full control of the soil particles;
  - g. All primary access roads to any permanent facility in the Landfill shall be paved;
  - h. To minimize the length of dirt roads, paved access roads to fill areas shall be extended as new fill areas are opened. Winter deck access roads shall be paved or surfaced with recycled asphalt, aggregate materials, or soil

stabilization products to minimize the quantity of untreated dirt;

- i. All paved roads in regular use shall be regularly cleaned to remove dirt left by trucks or other vehicles;
- j. Except when there is sufficient rain or moisture to prevent dust, all dirt roads in regular use shall be watered at least once daily on operating days and more often if required by the DPH or the Department of Public Works, or otherwise treated to control dust emissions;
- k. Loads of Solid Waste capable of producing significant dust shall be watered during the Landfill process. If such practice is deemed unacceptable to the RWQCB, the Permittee shall develop alternative methods to minimize dust generation during the Landfill process and obtain approval of the method from the Department of Public Works within 90 days of the RWQCB's determination;
- I. In addition to any fire flow requirements of the County Fire Department, the Permittee shall maintain a supply of water for dust control in the active Working Face areas to ensure compliance with State Minimum Standards; and
- m. The Permittee shall install and maintain devices on-site, as approved by the SCAQMD, to monitor wind speed and direction, and shall retain qualified personnel who can read and interpret data from these devices, can obtain and use information on predicted wind conditions, and can assist in the Facility's operations related to this information.
- 72. Permittee shall submit а quarterly report to the Department of the Department of Public Works identifying: (1) all fugitive dust and odor complaints from local residents that the Permittee has received for that guarter regarding the Facility; (2) all notices of violation issued by the SCAQMD or the DPH; and (3) all measures undertaken by the Permittee to address these complaints and/or correct the violations. The Department of Public Works and the DPH shall each have the authority to require the Permittee to implement additional corrective measures for complaints of this nature when such measures are deemed necessary to protect public health and safety.

# TRAFFIC AND ROAD IMPROVEMENT

73. Within 90 days after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall submit for review and approval by the Department of Public Works a plan that establishes a program to reduce unnecessary truck trips and queuing of trucks at the Facility and shall implement the approved plan. The program shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements:

- a. A plan to schedule regular Facility users, such as commercial and municipal haulers, to avoid having these users arrive at the Facility and queue on public streets right-of-ways or be diverted to other landfills;
- b. A plan to reserve Landfill capacity until 2 p.m. Monday through Friday during normal operating conditions, for small commercial and private users; and
- c. A plan to discourage Landfill customers from delivering loads of less than one ton to the Facility.
- 74. Within 90 days after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall implement a program to include, at a minimum, measures to minimize or avoid the queuing of trucks at the Facility entrance or on SR-126 Highway and any other adjacent streets due to waste delivery or landfilling activities at all times. At any given time, no off-site queuing shall be allowed. The program shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works. A report on the effectiveness of the program shall be submitted as part of the annual report required pursuant to Part XII of the IMP.
- 75. Within one year from the Effective Date, the Permittee shall close the existing site entrance on Henry Mayo Drive (SR-126) and relocate the site entrance, along with all its auxiliary facilities to a new site entrance located on Wolcott Drive as shown in Exhibit "A". In the event that the Permittee is unable to relocate the site entrance within a year, the Permittee may request a one-time extension from the Department of Public Works. The extension may be granted at the sole discretion of the Department of Public Works, if the Permittee demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works that the extension is needed due to activities beyond the Permittee's control and Permittee is making good faith efforts to relocate the Site entrance. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the total duration of the time extension shall not exceed 180 days.
- 76. The designated haul route shall be as follows:

Truck traffic to the Facility from the I-5 FWY shall be restricted to the following route: (a) SR-126 and (b) Wolcott Way to travel to the Facility Driveway. Unless necessitated by road closure or other detour plan implemented by the local jurisdictions, at no time shall any truck movement under the Permittee's control to the Facility from I-5 FWY take place on any other route.

Truck traffic to I-5 FWY from the Facility shall be restricted to the following route: (a) Wolcott Way and (b) SR-126 and enter I-5 FWY at the SR-126 on-ramp. Unless necessitated by road closure or other detour plan implemented by the local jurisdictions, at no time shall any truck movement under the Permittee's control to I-5 FWY from the Landfill take place on any other route.

- 77. Within 90 days after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall provide to the Department of Public Works for review and approval a set of schedules for commencement of the "Chiquita Canyon Landfill Street Improvement Project." The street improvements identified in the "Chiquita Canyon Landfill Street Improvement Project" shall be in accordance with the following:
  - a. The Permittee shall be responsible for the following Right-of-Way and Street Improvement Requirements:
    - i. Construct full street improvements on Wolcott Way and Franklin Parkway within the project frontage compatible with the ultimate improvements per Tentative Tract Map No. 53108 to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.
    - The design and construction on Wolcott Way should be compatible with vertical approaches to the future grade separations at the SR-126 to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and Caltrans.
    - iii. Dedicate right-of-way at a minimum of 70 feet from the latest approved centerline on SR-126, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and Caltrans. The typical section and the ultimate right-of-way are contingent upon the traffic study demonstrating that the project volumes do not exceed the road capacity. In the event the project volumes exceed the road capacity provide additional right-of-way for additional lanes, exclusive right turn lanes and transition improvements to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and Caltrans.
    - iv. Provide slope easements at the future SR-126/Wolcott Way interchange to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and Caltrans.
    - v. Comply with mitigation measures including offsite improvements identified in the approved Traffic Study Analysis to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.
    - vi. Provide signing and striping plans for Wolcott Way, Franklin Parkway, and any other offsite roadway based on the mitigations contained in the approved Traffic Study.
    - vii. Remit the fees which have been established by the Board of Supervisors for the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District. The fee amount is due and payable prior to the Effective Date and is based upon the fee rate in effect at the time of the Project's Effective Date. The current fee rate is \$23,780

per Factored Development Unit (FDU) and is subject to change. Per the current Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District Report, each gross acre of a commercial site is assessed at five times the applicable FDU rate. Similarly, each gross acre of an industrial site is assessed at three times the applicable FDU rate.

- viii. The Permittee shall install drainage structures and comply with all other drainage requirements of the Department of Public Works and any additional requirements of the RWQCB as well as any other regulatory agency with appropriate jurisdiction. Except as specifically otherwise approved by the Department of Public Works, all drainage structures including sedimentation basins shall be designed and constructed so as to accommodate run-off from a capital storm.
- ix. The Landfill and drainage structures shall in all cases be designed so as to cause surface water to be diverted away from the disposal areas.
- x. The Permittee shall further comply with all grading requirements of the Department of Public Works and Los Angeles County Ordinance.
- xi. The Permittee shall comply with the following requirements of Street Lighting Section of the Traffic and Lighting Division of the Department of Public Works where the installations of street lights are required. Prior to approval of any street improvement plan, Permittee submit a street lighting plan to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works. Any proposed street lights that are not within the existing lighting maintenance district will need to be annexed to the district before street lighting plans can be approved.
  - a. Within one year from the Effective Date, the Permittee shall provide street lights on concrete poles with underground wiring on all streets around the project boundaries to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works. The Permittee shall also contact Caltrans for street lighting requirements on Henry Mayo Drive (SR-126).
  - b. Within 30 days of the Effective Date, the Permittee shall contact Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Street Lighting Section to commence and complete the Lighting District Annexation process for

the operation and maintenance of the street lights around the project boundary.

- xii. Permittee shall pay all applicable review fees for review of all plans and engineering reports.
- xiii. Acquire street plan approval from the Department of Public Works or direct check status before obtaining grading permit.
- xiv. Within 90 days or as otherwise determined by the Department of Public Works, after the approval of the "Chiquita Canyon Landfill Street Improvement Project", execute an Improvement Agreement for the street improvements identified in this Condition No. 77 Subsection (a).
- xv. Within 360 days after the Effective Date of this grant, the Permittee shall pay its fair share to fully improve, the pavement and thickening of the base/sub base to sustain the entire truck traffic loading of the project operation and any increase in project operation on the following streets or as required to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works: (1) Wolcott Way between Franklin Parkway and SR-126. The Department of Public Works, at his/her sole discretion, may grant an extension of time not to exceed an additional 360 days if the Permittee demonstrates good faith effort toward construction and completion of this condition 77 Subsection (xv).
- b. Once every 5 years beginning on the Effective Date of this grant and continuing for the duration of this grant, the Permittee shall conduct a Roadway Section Analysis to include a pavement section evaluation of the designated haul route (Wolcott Way and SR-126 to the Facility entrance), as well as all truck counts and traffic index calculation sheets. The findings of the revised Roadway Section Analysis shall be provided to the Department of Public Works and the City of Santa Clarita for review and approval. The Permittee shall be responsible for the pro-rata costs of improving the pavement structure of the roadway segments along the designated haul route per the recommendations in the revised Roadway Section Analysis. Upon construction of any necessary improvements to the pavement structure, the Permittee shall conduct baseline deflection testing in accordance with California Test method 356 and submit the results to the Department of Public Works for review and approval.
- c. Once every 5 years beginning on the Effective Date of this grant and continuing for the duration of this grant, the Permittee shall conduct machine-generated truck counts at the project site entrance on three consecutive days (Tuesday through Thursday) during weeks void of

national holidays. The truck counts shall be conducted by an independent count company in accordance with generally accepted traffic counting procedures. The Permittee shall also calculate the 10-year Design Traffic Indices along the designated haul route Wolcott Way and SR-126 to the Facility entrance), based on the truck counts and submit them to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. Lastly, the Permittee shall perform deflection tests along the designated haul route in accordance with California Test Method 356 and submit the results to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. If the retested 80 percentile deflection exceeds 32 percent of the tolerable deflection, the Permittee shall pay its fair share to fully remediate the pavement structure. The Permittee shall submit to the Department of Public Works the proposed method of remediation and schedule for commencement of the improvement for review and approval.

In no event shall the "Chiquita Canyon Landfill Street Improvement Project" be more than 24 months from the Approval Date, unless otherwise extended by the Department of Public Works.

- 78. In the event the Permittee elects to construct and operate a commercial-scale Conversion Technology facility at the Facility or other location in the Unincorporated County areas of the Santa Clarita Valley as approved the Department of Public Works, the Permittee is required to prepare and submit a traffic impact study to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. If the traffic impact study identifies traffic impacts, the Permittee will be required to fund and/or build adequate traffic improvements, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.
- 79. The Department of Public Works, the LEA, and the CAC may monitor the performance of the conditions of this grant designed to minimize truck traffic impact. In the event such measures are found to be inadequate, such entity or entities shall notify the Director of Regional Planning and describe the inadequacy of the conditions.

## LITTER CONTROL AND RECOVERY

- 80. The Permittee shall adopt a program that uses the most effective methods and technology to prevent waste that has entered an area under the Permittee's control from escaping the area in the form of litter. Notwithstanding any other provision of this grant, the Permittee shall cease accepting incoming waste during high wind conditions if, despite the methods and technology used for controlling litter, waste cannot be confined to areas under the Permittee's control.
- 81. Within 30 days after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall submit a litter control program to the DPH and the Department of Public Works for review and approval that uses the most effective methods and technology to prevent waste that has

entered an area under the Permittee's control from escaping the area in the form of litter. Permittee shall implement the program as approved and submit any revisions to the Department of Public Works for approval. The program shall include the following requirements, unless the DPH requires otherwise or the Department of Public Works approves altertative measures after determining that they are at least as effective in controlling litter:

- a. Facility personnel shall continuously patrol the access road to the Facility scales during the Facility's hours of operation and remove any litter found during the patrol;
- b. Loads of Solid Waste that are improperly covered or contained and that may create significant litter shall be immediately detained, and if practicable, properly covered or contained prior to proceeding to the Working Face. If such a remedial measure cannot be taken, the load shall proceed to the Working Face under escort;
- c. All debris found on or along the entrance to the Facility and/or Working Face access roads shall be immediately removed;
- d. Operating areas shall be located in wind shielded portions of the landfill during windy periods;
- e. The landfill operator shall install speed bumps on landfill property in paved areas along the route of trucks leaving the landfill. The purpose of the speed bumps is to knock out dirt and debris accumulated in wheel wells before trucks leave the facility;
- f. The Permittee shall require open-bed trucks exiting the landfill either to be swept clean of loose debris or to be covered so as-to minimize the possibility of litter escaping onto State Route 126.

The permittee shall comply with this condition and Part XVI of the IMP.

- 82. Within 90 days after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall develop methods and/or procedures to prevent or minimize vehicles from carrying dirt and/or debris that may be dislodged onto local streets and highways and submit the methods and/or procedures for approval, and implement the approved measures to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.
- 83. In addition to the requirements described in Condition Nos. 80 and 81, the Permittee shall develop and maintain a litter recovery program to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and the DPH designed to recover off-site litter from uncovered or improperly covered or contained loads traveling to the Facility or otherwise emanating from the Facility, including conducting weekly inspections of the surrounding neighborhoods within a 1-mile radius of the property boundary

of the combined facility. Based upon the inspection, the Permittee shall collect and remove all wind-blown Trash or litter encountered in the specified area. The Permittee shall maintain a log of the inspections, provide the log upon request to the DPH and the Department of Public Works, and include a copy of the log in the annual report required pursuant to Part XII of the IMP. The Department of Public Works, at its sole discretion may increase the frequency of the litter pickup and recovery or adjust the boundary of the specified area or to improve the effectiveness of the litter recovery program.

- 84. The Permittee shall monitor Chiquito Canyon Road, SR 126, Wolcott Way, Franklin Parkway, and other feeder roads to the entrance to Val Verde at Rancho Aviles and the surrounding area within 100 feet of the centerline of the road (except along SR-126 where collection would start at the shoulder for safety reasons) or to any existing fence on private property for the purpose of locating and cleaning up litter in this area. Litter pickup shall be a minimum of one time per week and may be increased, upon agreement between the landfill operator and the CAC, to maintain a litter free environment
- 85. The Permittee shall develop and implement a vehicle tarping program at the Facility that effectively discourages uncovered vehicles from using the Facility. Within 30 days after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall submit such vehicle tarping program for approval by the Department of Public Works. Such program shall provide that all vehicles loaded with Solid Waste or any other material that creates the potential for litter shall be fully tarped or otherwise contained when entering and leaving the Facility, and that no such vehicle shall be allowed to enter the Facility until the driver has been informed of the tarping requirements and has been asked to have his/her load covered. The program shall impose penalties on repeat violators up to and including being permanently prohibited from using the Facility.

## **OTHER PERMITS/REQUIREMENTS**

- 86. The Permittee shall monitor and maintain the Facility's Environmental Protection and Control Systems in perpetuity, or until such time as the Department of Public Works, based on generally accepted engineering practice, determines that the routine maintenance and foreseeable corrective action that may be necessary during and after the Post-Closure Maintenance Period has been fully satisfied, and the Solid Waste disposed of in the Landfill no longer constitutes a threat to public health and safety, or to the environment.
- 87. The Permittee shall take all necessary measures to ensure that noise emissions from the Facility at all residential receptors are within the acceptable limits of the Los Angeles County Noise Ordinance, as contained in Chapter 12.08 of the County Code.
- 88. The Permittee shall implement effective vector control measures at the Facility pursuant to State standards, as directed by the DPH.
- 89. Any future traffic circulation scenario outside the current haul routes shall avoid areas of high biological diversity. Prior to utilization of a new haul route, the Permittee shall submit the proposed haul route with all supporting information/report/survey of biological resources in the vicinity of the proposed haul route to the Department for review and approval. The Department shall consult with the Department of Public Works regarding any changes to the current haul route.
- 90. For fire protection purposes, the Permittee shall maintain on-site fire response capabilities, construct access roads, and provide water tanks, water mains, fire hydrants, and fire flows, to the satisfaction of the County Fire Department including, but not limited to the following:
  - a. A Class II Standpipe System shall be provided and located within 200 feet of the landfill footprint and shall have sufficient 1 1/2-inch hose with a variable-fog nozzle to reach all portions of such operations. The use of water tender trucks may be permitted in lieu of a Class II Standpipe System provided each is equipped with 2 1/2-inch outlets for County Fire Department's use.
  - b. Approved access roads no less than 20 feet in width clear to the sky shall be provided and maintained at all times around the landfilling areas to provide access for firefighting equipment. Weeds, grass, and combustible vegetation shall be removed for a distance of 10 feet on both sides of all access roads used by solid waste trucks or the public. All access within the landfill site shall be in accordance and compliance with the County Fire Code and standards.
- 91. All development pursuant to this grant must be kept in full compliance with County Fire Department Regulation 10. Construction plans for access roads shall be submitted to the County Fire Department for review and approval.
- 92. All on-site fuel storage tanks shall be installed and necessary containment and air quality controls for the tanks provided, in accordance with the requirements of the County Fire Department, the Department of Public Works, the RWQCB, and the SCAQMD.
- 93. The Permittee shall develop and implement a program to identify and conserve all significant archaeological and paleontological materials found at the Facility pursuant to Part IX of the IMP. If the Permittee finds any evidence of aboriginal habitation or fossils during earthmoving activities, Landfill operations shall immediately cease in that immediate area, and the evidence and area shall be preserved until a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist, as appropriate,

makes a determination as to the significance of the evidence. The Department will review and approve this program, if the determination indicates that the archaeological or paleontological resources are significant, the resources shall be recovered to the extent practicable prior to resuming Landfill operations in that immediate area of the Landfill.

- 94. The Permittee shall develop and obtain approval from the Department of Public Works for a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for the Facility's activities, unless the Department of Public Works determines that such plan is unnecessary.
- 95. The Permittee is prohibited from initiating any activity for which an Industrial Waste Disposal Permit and/or Underground Storage Tanks Permit is required at the Facility without the required permit from the Department of Public Works, and the Permittee shall conduct such activities in compliance with all applicable regulations and permits.. The activities covered by this Condition No. 95 include, but are not limited to, the installation, modification, or removal of any underground storage tank and/or industrial waste control facility. For purposes of this Condition No. 95, an industrial waste control facility includes its permanent structures for treating post-development storm water runoff.
- 96. The Permittee shall at all operating times, Monday through Saturday, maintain adequate on-site staff, with appropriate training and experience for the operation of the Facility. At least one on-site senior level member shall be familiar with or have access to an electronic or hard copy of this grant and possessed a SWANA Manager of Landfill Operation (MOLO) certification.
- 97. The Permittee shall at all times, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, make available at least one emergency contact person, with sufficient expertise to assess the need for remedial action regarding operation-related accidents, and with the requisite authority and means to assemble the necessary resources to take such remedial action. The individual must be able to be reached on a continuous basis through the telephone number or e-mail address posted at the Facility entry gate.
- 98. Within 90 days after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall submit a completed application to the Task Force for a "Finding of Conformance" that the proposed project and its expansions are consistent with the Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element. The application must comply with all of the submittal requirements set forth in Table 10-1 thereof. The Permittee shall also promptly comply with any requests from the Task Force for additional information needed in connection with the application and shall comply with all conditions of such Finding of Conformance.
- 99. Upon the Effective Date, the membership of the Alternative Technology Advisory Subcommittee of the Task Force shall be increased to include a representative of the Permittee and an environmental representative designated by the Fifth Supervisorial District to represent the Santa Clarita Valley. Notwithstanding the

preceding sentence, the membership of the Alternative Technology Advisory Subcommittee may be adjusted at the sole discretion of the Department of Public Works, acting as the Chair of the Task Force, as necessary upon the recommendation of the Task Force.

- 100. All employee, guest, and truck parking shall be developed and maintained as set forth in Part 11, Chapter 22.52 of the County Code.
- 101. All salvage material stored at the Facility (except materials which are to be used for landfill operations), dumpsters, containers, construction materials, and disabled trucks and equipment shall be consolidated into one or more areas that are screened by fences or other means from public streets and adjacent private lands not owned by the Permittee, in accordance with the provisions of Part 7, Chapter 22.52 of the County Code.
- 102. The perimeter of the Landfill shall be designed to discourage unauthorized access by persons and vehicles by using a perimeter barrier (such as fencing) or topographic constraints. enclosed by fencing to inhibit unauthorized entry. Except as otherwise required by the DPH, fencing shall conform to the detail shown on the approved Exhibit "A".
- 103. Business signs shall be as permitted by Part 10, Chapter 22.52 of the County Code for Zone C-1, except that no portion of any such sign may extend more than 15 feet above the ground and the total sign area shall be based upon a street or building frontage of 100 feet.
- 104. Within 10 years after the Effective Date, and every 10 years thereafter, the Department of Public Works, in consultation with the Department and the Permittee, shall select an independent consultant(s) with expertise in engineering and planning, to conduct a comprehensive study analyzing various alternatives to serve the long-term Solid Waste Disposal needs of the Santa Clarita Valley. The purpose of the study is to ensure uninterrupted solid waste disposal services to the residents and businesses in the Santa Clarita Valley, keeping disposal fees low and stable, making existing facilities as efficient as possible, and ensuring that facilities keep pace with population growth and changing technologies in the solid waste industry. The study should include a comprehensive analyses (including a sensitivity and cost-to-benefit analysis) of all aspects of this endeavor, including but not limited to, the economic, environmental, and technical feasibility of the following alternatives/issues:
  - a. Evaluating rail and truck transport options for solid waste export out of the Santa Clarita Valley, including the necessary infrastructure (in and out of the Santa Clarita Valley) to realize these options.
  - b. Demonstrating how any proposed waste-by-rail option would tie into the existing or future county waste-by-rail system.

#### PROJECT NO. R2004-00559-(5) CUP 200400042, OAK 201500007

- c. Developing Conversion Technology facilities in the Santa Clarita Valley.
- d. Planning a future transfer station system in the Santa Clarita Valley.
- e. Reviewing public/private ownership options.
- f. Analyzing financing, staffing, and rate impacts.
- g. Defining and establishing the facility siting processes.
- h. Establishing a process for involving interested parties in the planning process.
- i. Any other alternatives and issues deemed appropriate by the Department of Public Works and/or the Department.

The costs of the study shall be equally shared by the Permittee and the Department of Public Works, Environmental Programs Division, but in no event shall the cost to the Permittee exceed \$50,000 per study. The Permittee shall make the payment within 30 days of receiving the invoice for the consultant's services. The study shall be completed within 18 months of the selection of the independent engineering/planning consultant(s). The study's findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the TAC for review and comment. Upon addressing all the TAC's comments to the satisfaction of the TAC, the independent engineering/planning consultant(s) shall submit the study to the Commission, the Department, the Department of Public Works, the Permittee, and all other interested parties. The Permittee shall submit a detailed response to the study's findings and recommendations, including which recommendations it plans to pursue. The Permittee shall make a good-faith effort to implement all recommendations to carry out the purpose of this Condition No. 103 to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

- 105. The Permittee shall implement and comply with the following seismic monitoring requirements:
  - a. Complete installation of an on-site accelerometer system to measure earthquake/seismic ground motions within 180 days after the Effective Date. The system design, including but not limited to, locations of sensors, shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works. A set of as-built plans signed and sealed by a California Registered Civil Engineer, or other registered professional approved by the Department of Public Works, shall be provided to DPH and the Department of Public Works.
  - b. Following a major earthquake/seismic ground motion of magnitude 5.0 or greater, as recorded by the closest ground-motion monitoring device as maintained by the California Division of Mines and Geology, thoroughly

48

survey the Facility for primary and secondary surface expressions of seismic activity (such as surface ruptures, landslides, change in spring flows, liquefaction, etc.). Submit a damage assessment report on the results of the survey to the Department of Public Works and the DPH for review. The assessment report shall describe and discuss all features, including damage to the site and infrastructure caused by the earthquake and measures that will be taken to mitigate the impact to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

- 106. The Permittee shall accept all Solid Waste and Beneficial Use Materials generated and delivered to the Facility by all waste haulers and customers operating in the Unincorporated County Areas of Santa Clarita Valley. The Permittee shall submit to the Department of Public Works an annual report on the origin of Solid Wasteand Beneficial Use Materials accepted at the Facility by jurisdiction of origin. The annual report shall also contain information on all waste haulers (including those owned or operated by the Permittee, its subsidiaries, or affiliated enterprises) and self-haul customers utilizing the Facility, whether (and why) any waste haulers and self-haul customers were turned away from the Facility, and the tipping fee charged for all waste haulers and self-haul customers. The Permittee shall not engage in predatory pricing that may discourage any private waste haulers and self-haul customers from utilizing the Facility.
- 107. Within 90 days after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall install video monitoring equipment at the Facility to record and monitor Landfill operations at each Working Face area and at other critical locations as determined by the Department of Public Works, between the period of 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant. Copies of the video recordings shall be provided to the Department of Public Works, DPH and the TAC upon request, and shall be kept and maintained at the Facility for one year after recording, unless the DPH determines, at its sole discretion, that the video recordings should be kept for a longer period to protect public health, safety, or the environment.
- 108. The Permittee shall provide four free quarterly clean-up days to residents of the community of Val Verde and Castaic, showing proper identification and proof of residence at the landfill entrance. These days may be Saturday or Sundays, subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works. The Permittee shall accept all Solid Waste delivered to the site with proof of residency during the event free of charge, up to 1 ton per residence, and promote the program in a newspaper of general circulation. The operator shall further reimburse the CAC for the cost of providing two roll-off bins in Val Verde and Castaic on each clean-up day with the locations determined by the CAC. The operator and CAC may jointly change this program if they mutually determine alternatives to the above can further assist the community.
- 109. The Permittee shall designate as open space for recreational use in perpetuity those portions of the site on which fill has or will be placed. In addition, the

permittee shall provide all funds needed for the preparation of a park feasibility study, park master plan and environmental documentation as well as reasonable funding for the development, operation and maintenance of the park to support recreational use upon closure of the Landfill.

Within one year of the effective date of this grant, the permittee shall submit a notice of intent to the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation, to complete a park master plan feasibility study with input from the Department of Parks and Recreation. Such study shall be submitted not later than January 1, 2040. The study will conceptually analyze options and funding needed for development, operation and maintenance of portions of the site on which fill has been or will be placed for recreational use. Upon approval of the study by the Director of Parks and Recreation, the Director of Parks and Recreation will use such study to establish an amount of funding that the Permittee will be required to provide for development, operation and maintenance of a park on the site. In the event that the amount of funding that is set aside is not sufficient to cover the activities of the park, the permittee shall supplement the funding deficiency.

At the discretion of the Director of Parks and Recreation, but no later than five years before the termination of disposal operations under this grant, the permittee will fund the completion of a park master plan for portions of the site on which fill has been or will be placed. Funding for the park master plan and environmental documentation will be held in an interest bearing trust account and will be available for the purpose of fulfilling this condition, at least five years before the termination of disposal operations under this grant.

If the designated park site is offered to and accepted by the County, then the County should have access to the funds in the trust account. Alternatively, the designated park site may be offered to another acceptable agency or entity, to the satisfaction of the Director of Regional Planning, and upon acceptance by said agency or entity, the funding would thereafter be available to such agency or entity.

### PERMITTEE FEES

- 110. The requirement that the Permittee pay the fees set forth in Condition Nos. 112 through 122, inclusive, shall not begin until the Effective Date. Prior to that date, any and all fees required by CUP 89-081 (5) shall remain in full force and effect. The following fees are cumulative and are in addition to any other fee or payment required by this grant.
- 111. All financial records shall be preserved for a period of 3 years and shall be available for inspection by the DPH, the Department of Public Works, the Department, and the Treasurer and Tax Collector during normal business hours, and shall be forwarded to such agencies upon request.
- 112. The Permittee shall pay to the office of the Los Angeles County Treasurer

and Tax Collector a quarterly fee equal to 10 percent of the sum of the following, net any amount the Permittee pays to the County pursuant to Section 4.63, et seq., of the County Code:

- a. The net tipping fees collected at the Facility as described below in this Condition No. 112. For purposes of this Condition No. 112, "net tipping fee" shall mean the total fees collected, less any taxes or regulatory fees imposed by a federal, state, or local agency that is included in the fee charged by the Permittee at the Facility entrance. "Total fees collected" shall be calculated as the total gross receipts collected by the Permittee; The net tipping fees collected at the landfill shall exclude any tipping fees received for waste processed at the material recovery, household hazardous waste and composting facilities approved in Conditions No. 24);
- b. The revenue generated from the sale of Landfill gas at the Facility, less any federal, state, or local fees or taxes applicable to such revenue; and
- c. The Revenue generated by any other activity or enterprise at the Facility, less any federal, state, or local fees or taxes applicable to such revenue.
- 113. The Permittee shall pay on a monthly basis to the Department of Public Works a fee of 25 cents per ton of all Solid Waste disposed received at the Landfill. The fee shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the CPI. This fee shall be used for the implementation and enhancement of waste reduction and diversion programs, including but not limited to, conducting document/paper shredding and waste tire collection events in County Unincorporated areas.
- 114. The Permittee shall pay on a monthly basis to the Department of Public Works a fee of 10 cents per ton of all Solid Waste disposed at the Landfill. The fee shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the CPI. This fee shall be used at the sole discretion of the Director of the Department of Public works for administration, implementation, and enhancement of disaster debris removal activities in Val Verde, Castaic, and other Unincorporated County areas surrounding the landfill, including providing waste disposal and collection service vouchers to assist residents in clean-up activities.
- 115. For the life of this grant, except as provided in Condition No. 116 of this grant, the Permittee shall pay on a monthly basis to the Department of Public Works a fee for every ton of Solid Waste originating within Los Angeles County but outside the Santa Clarita Valley Area that is processed for beneficial use, composting and/or disposed of at the Facility during the preceding month, according to the following rates:

| Fee            |
|----------------|
| \$2.00 per ton |
| \$4.00 per ton |
| \$6.00 per ton |
| \$8.00 per ton |
|                |

For the life of this grant, except as provided in Condition No. 116, the Permittee shall pay on a monthly basis to the Department of Public Works a fee of \$10.00 per ton for all Solid Waste and Beneficial Use Materials originating outside of Los Angeles County that is processed for beneficial use, composting and/or disposed of at the Facility during the preceding month.

The fee shall be used to fund programs and activities that 1) fund environmental, educational, and quality of life programs in Val Verde, Castaic, and other Unincorporated County areas surrounding the landfill, 2) enhance Countywide disposal capacity, mitigate landfill impacts in the Unincorporated County areas, and 3) promote development of Conversion Technology facilities that benefit the County.

The fee applicable for every ton of material originating outside the Santa Clarita Valley Area but within Los Angeles County shall be determined using the above tiered-structured table and by dividing the total incoming waste from outside the Santa Clarita Valley by the number of delivery days. For example, if the monthly total is 50,000 tons and number of delivery days is 20, then the average quantity is 2,500 TPD, and the fee is the sum of ( $2 \times 1,999$ ) + ( $4 \times 501$ ) =  $6,002 \times 1,002$  number of delivery days. The fee shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the CPI.

One third (33.3 percent) of the monthly payment shall be deposited by the Department of Public Works into an interest-bearing deferred Unincorporated Community Program Account, created and maintained by the Department of Public Works to fund programs and activities that enhance and environmental, educational, and quality of life programs in the communities of Val Verde, Castaic, and other Unincorporated County areas surrounding the landfill.

Another one third (33.3 percent) of each monthly payment shall be deposited by the Department of Public Works into an interest-bearing deferred Landfill Mitigation Program Account, created and maintained by the Department of Public Works to fund programs and activities that enhance Countywide disposal capacity and mitigate landfill gas impacts in the Unincorporated County areas.

The remaining one third (33.3 percent) of the monthly payment shall be deposited into an interest-bearing deferred Alternative-to-Landfilling

52

Technology Account, created and maintained by the Department of Public Works to fund research and activities that promote the development of Conversion Technology facilities that benefit the County.

In the event the Department of Public Works, in consultation with the Director of Regional Planning, determines that the Permittee has constructed and commenced operation of a Conversion Technology facility in full satisfaction of the requirements of Condition No. 116 of this grant, the fee requirement of this Condition No. 115 shall thereafter be reduced by one-third (33.3 percent). The new rate shall be as follows, but only so long as the Conversion Technology facility is operating:

| Disposal Quantity<br>(Tons/Day) | Fee            |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 - 1,999                       | \$1.32 per ton |
| 2,000-3,999                     | \$2.64 per ton |
| 4,000-5,999                     | \$3.96 per ton |
| 6,000-7,000                     | \$5.28 per ton |

The fee applicable to all Solid Waste and Beneficial Use Material originating outside of Los Angeles County shall remain unchanged. Upon the effective date of the new rate, the funds generated from this fee shall be split equally between the Unincorporated Community Program Account and Landfill Mitigation Program Account.

In the event the Permittee elects to construct and operate a commercial-scale 116. Conversion Technology facility (excluding composting facilities) at the Facility or other location in the County as approved by the Director of Public Works, the Permittee may seek to provide such facility in lieu of paying thirty-four (34) percent of fee required by Condition No. 115 of this grant. "Construct and operate" shall mean fully funding and successfully completing the siting, design, permitting, and construction of an operating facility for the conversion of a minimum of 500 tons per day of Solid Waste into useful products, fuels, and/or energy through no-combustion thermal, chemical, or biological processes (excluding composting facilities). The Permittee shall be responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and approvals required to construct and operate the facility. The facility must be fully permitted, operational, and processing at least 50 percent of the daily tonnage permitted for such facility on the 5th anniversary of the Effective Date and fully operational by the 6th anniversary of the Effective Date.

After the Director of Public Works has verified the Conversion Technology facility (excluding composting facilities) has commenced operation and is in full satisfaction of the requirements of Condition No. 116 of this grant, the Permittee may request reimbursement from the Alternative-to-Landfilling Technology Account, created and maintained by the Department of Public Works. Eligible expenditures for reimbursement include design, permitting, environmental document preparation, construction, and inspection that are verified by the Department of Public Works as necessary and directly related to the development of a Conversion Technology Facility (excluding composting facilities) that meets the requirements of Condition No. 116 of this grant.

The Permittee must provide access to the Department of Public Works and its independent consultant(s) to all areas of the facility during all phases of the development and must respond to information requests, including operating and performance data, from the Department of Public Works in a timely manner. The Permittee shall provide tours of the facility to the public at the request of the Department of Public Works.

Upon the Effective Date of this grant, the Permittee shall submit to the Department of Public Works for review and comment quarterly reports, providing detailed status of the selection of the type of Conversion Technology and progress of the development. Within one year after the Effective Date, the Permittee must submit a proposal for the type, location, and preliminary design of the Conversion Technology facility for review and approval by the Department of Public Works in consultation with the Director of Regional Planning. As part of the proposal, the Permittee shall submit a detailed project milestone schedule, including at a minimum, a scheduled completion date for permit approvals, financing, 30 percent, 60 percent, and 90 percent design levels, construction completion, start-up, acceptance testing, and beginning of commercial operations. Within 6 months of receipt of the proposal, the Department of Public Works shall notify the Permittee of the findings of its review and determination as to whether a Conversion Technology Facility is or is not anticipated to be successfully developed in accordance with the requirement of this Condition No. 116.

When the Conversion Technology Facility is permitted, developed and in operation, the Permittee shall submit to the Department of Public Works quarterly informational reports including quantities of feedstock, output materials, output gas, energy, and/or fuel as well as an annual report for review and comment providing detailed status of the operation, permits, and regulatory compliance of the Conversion Technology facility, including quantities and origins of feedstock, quantities of output, design life, and performance efficiency.

In the event that a Conversion Technology facility is not anticipated to be successfully developed by the 5th anniversary of the Effective Date, the

Permittee may submit a request for a one-year time extension to the Department of Public Works, no later than 3 months prior to the 5th anniversary of the Effective Date. The extension may be granted at the sole discretion of the Department of Public Works, if the Permittee demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works, that it has made good faith efforts towards developing the facility, and shows that circumstances related to the facility's permitting process and other events outside of the Permittee's control prevented the facility from being fully permitted and operational. Similarly, a one-year time extension may also be granted up to 2 additional times, at the request of the Permittee. Such additional requests shall each be received no later than 3 months prior to the anniversary of the Effective Date after the 6th and 7th years. The total duration of the time extension(s) shall not exceed 3 years.

- 117. Pursuant to Goal 2.4.2 of the Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element adopted by the Board in 1997, and the Board's policy adopted on July 27, 1999 to promote the development of alternatives to landfill and incineration processes, the Permittee shall contribute \$200,000 annually, not to exceed \$3,000,000 for the life of this grant, to an alternative technology development fund, which fund shall be an interest bearing account established and maintained by the Department of Public Works. This fund shall be used to research, promote, and develop the alternative technologies that are most appropriate for Southern California from an environmental and economic perspective. The determination of appropriate alternative technologies as well as the use of the fund shall be made by the Department of Public Works. Within six months after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall deposit its first \$200,000 payment required by this Condition No. 117, and thereafter annually by March 31.
- 118. By March 31 of each year, the Permittee shall pay to the Department of Public Works an annual fee of \$0.50 per ton of all Solid Waste disposed at the Landfill during the preceding calendar year. The fee shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the CPI. This annual payment shall be deposited into an interest bearing trust fund established to acquire and/or develop natural habitat and parkland within the Santa Clarita Valley. No monies from this trust fund shall be used for projects or programs that benefit areas outside the communities surrounding the Landfill. The Director of Public Works shall administer the trust fund in consultation with the Director of Parks and Recreations, and all monies in the trust fund, including accrued interest, shall be spent for park and recreational purposes.
- 119. By March 31 of each year, the Permittee shall pay to the Department of Public Works an annual fee of \$0.50 per ton of all Solid Waste disposed at the Landfill during the preceding calendar year. The fee shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the CPI. This annual payment shall be deposited by the Department of Public Works into an interest bearing trust fund established to provide funding for road improvements in the Val Verde, Castaic, and other Unincorporated County areas surrounding the landfill. The Department of Public

Works shall administer this trust fund, and all monies in the trust fund, including accrued interest, shall be disbursed by Department of Public Works.

- 120. By January 10 of every other year, the Permittee shall pay to the Department of Regional Planning a sum of \$50,000 for the purpose of financing planning studies, including, but not limited to neighborhood planning studies for Val Verde, Castaic, and the Unincorporated Santa Clarita Valley, as determined by the Director of Regional Planning. The fee shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the CPI. The payments shall be held in an interest-bearing account. Payment for the first year is due within 90 days after the Effective Date. Should there be monies remaining in the account, not spent on planning studies or committed to use on such studies within the identified area, such fees will be returned to the permittee at the termination of the permit.
- 121. By March 31 of each year, the Permittee shall pay to the Department Regional Planning a fee of \$1.00 per ton of all Solid Waste disposed at the Landfill during the preceding calendar year. The payment shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the CPI. The payments shall be deposited by the Director of Regional Planning into an interest-bearing community benefit and environmental education trust fund, created and maintained by the Director of Regional Planning. This fund shall be used to fund environmental, educational, and quality of life programs in the Val Verde, Castaic, and other Unincorporated County areas surrounding the landfill, and to fund regional public facilities that serve this area. All disbursement of the monies in the fund shall be determined by the Director of Regional Planning.
- 122. The Permittee shall fund 10 collection events per year to be held by the Department of Public Works for the collection of Household Hazardous Waste and Electronic Waste, including discarded computers. The cost of each event shall be \$100,000, adjusted annually in accordance with the CPI. The Permittee shall make annual payments for these events. The first payment is due within 90 days after the Effective Date, and the subsequent payments are due by March 31 of each year.

In lieu of paying for 5 of the 10 collection events per year, the Permittee may instead elect the following option:

The Permittee will fully fund the siting, development, operation, and staffing of a new permanent Santa Clarity Valley Environmental Collection Center at the Facility or other location in the Unincorporated areas of the Santa Clarita Valley (substantially similar in design to the Antelope Valley Environmental Collection Center) for the collection of household hazardous/electronic waste. The Permittee shall be responsible for building, constructing, and obtaining all necessary permits and approvals required to operate the center. The center, whose design and location must be approved by the Department of Public

56

Works, must be open at least twice a month to all County residents. The operating hours shall be similar to that of the Antelope Valley Environmental Collection Center or as determined by the Department of Public Works. Upon the center's opening, the Permittee shall implement an on-going comprehensive promotional campaign to reach all Santa Clarita Valley residents. The campaign must be reviewed and approved by Public Works in consultation with other interested entities.

In the event the Permittee elects above option, the Permittee shall notify the Department of Public Works of its decision within 90 days of the Effective Date, along with a detailed project timeline (including, but not limited to, estimated project costs, etc.) for review and approval. The Department of Public Works reserves the right to determine whether the Permittee has satisfied the requirements for payment deduction and when the deduction will commence, and if necessary, prorate the payments to meet the intent of this Condition No. 122.

- 123. Prior to the Effective Date, the Permittee shall:
  - Deposit the sum of \$20,000 with the Department. The deposit shall a. be placed in a performance fund draw-down account, which shall be used exclusively to compensate the Department for all expenses incurred while inspecting the premises to determine the Permittee's compliance with the conditions of this grant, to review and verify any and all information contained in the required reports of this grant, and to undertake any other activity of the Department to ensure that the conditions of this grant are satisfied, including, but not limited to, carrying out the following activities: enforcement, permitting, inspections (amount charged per each inspection shall be \$200.00, or the current recovery cost, whichever is greater), providing administrative support in the oversight and enforcement of these conditions, performing technical studies, and retaining the services of an independent consultant for any of the aforementioned purposes, or for routine monitoring of any and/or all of the conditions of this grant for a minimum of 5 years. Inspections shall be conducted biennially (once every other year) to ensure that any development undertaken on the subject property is in accordance with the approved Exhibit "A" on file. If the actual costs incurred pursuant to this Condition No. 123 (a) have reached 80 percent of the amount of the initial deposit (\$16,000), and the Permittee has been so notified, the Permittee shall deposit supplemental funds to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit (\$20,000) within 10 business days of such notification. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required during the life of this grant. At the sole discretion of the Permittee, the Permittee may deposit an initial or supplemental amount that exceeds the minimum amounts required by this Condition No. 123 (a).

#### PROJECT NO. R2004-00559-(5) CUP 200400042, OAK 201500007

58

- Deposit the sum of \$50,000 in an interest-bearing trust fund with b. the Department of Public Works from which actual costs billed and not honored by the Permittee will be deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the Department of Public Works' review and verification of any and all information contained in the required reports of this grant and the MMRP, and any other activity of the Department of Public Works to ensure that the conditions of this grant are satisfied, including, but not limited to, carrying out the following activities: enforcement, permitting. inspections, coordination of mitigation monitoring, providing administrative support in the oversight and enforcement of these conditions, performing technical studies, and retaining the services of an independent consultant for any of the aforementioned purposes or for routine monitoring of any and/or all of the conditions of this grant for a minimum of 5 years. If the costs incurred pursuant to this Condition No. 123 (b) have reached 80 percent of the amount of the initial deposit (\$40,000), and the Permittee has been so notified, the Permittee shall deposit supplemental funds to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit (\$50,000) within 10 business days of such notification. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required during the life of this grant. At the sole discretion of the Permittee, the Permittee may deposit an initial or supplemental amount that exceeds the minimum amounts required by this Condition No. 123 (b).
- c. The balance remaining including interest in the draw-down account as described in Subsection (a) above and trust fund as described in Subsection (b) above shall be returned to the Permittee upon the Director of Public Works' determination that the Landfill is no longer a threat to public health, safety, and the environment.

# LEGISLATION

- 124. The Permittee shall support legislation and regulations that will promote the development of Conversion Technologies. The Permittee shall consult with the Department of Public Works to determine which legislation and regulations will promote the development of Conversion Technologies. The Permittee shall submit correspondence to the State legislature to support legislation and regulations which, at a minimum:
  - a. Provides economic incentives for the development of Conversion Technologies;
  - b. Removes from the definition of transformation under Section 40201 of the California Public Resources Code any technologies and/or processes categorized as Conversion Technologies;

- c. Provides full diversion credit for waste managed by these Conversion Technologies towards the State's waste reduction mandates; and/or
- d. Remove any unnecessary regulatory hurdles that impede such development.
- 125. The Permittee shall continue working with the waste industry, in concert with cities, the County, and other stakeholders in the industry, to seek amendment of existing laws and regulations to require that compliance with the State's waste reduction mandates be measured by diversion program implementation as opposed to disposal quantity measurement, and to further require the Statemandated Disposal Reporting System to be used solely to identify waste generation and disposal trends.

### COMMUNITY INFORMATION/INQUIRIES

- 126. The Permittee shall post a sign at the entrance gate to the Facility providing the following information:
  - a. The telephone number of the hotline to contact the Permittee on a 24hour basis to register complaints regarding the Facility's operations. All complaints received shall be reported to the Director of Regional Planning, and other agencies, as appropriate, on the same day but no later than 10 a.m. of the following business day. Said telephone number shall be published in the local telephone directory, Permittee's website and local library;
  - b. The telephone number of the DPH and the hours that the DPH office is staffed; and
  - c. The telephone number of SCAQMD's enforcement offices and the hours that the SCAQMD offices are staffed.
- 127. The Permittee shall maintain a hotline/emergency log at the Facility which shall record all complaints received regarding Landfill operations. The record of complaints shall include the date and time, nature of complaints, and actions taken to identify and resolve the complaint. The Permittee shall at all times, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, provide at least one emergency contact person, with sufficient expertise to assess the need for remedial action to promptly respond to complaints from the surrounding neighborhood regarding dust, litter, odor, air quality, or other operational issues. The Permittee shall resolve all complaints to the satisfaction of the Director of Regional Planning. Permittee shall maintain records of this hotline for 3 years, made available upon request, and submitted as part of the annual report required pursuant to Part XII of the IMP. The records shall include information of all complaints received regarding

the landfill operations, the Permittee's follow-up action to the complaints, and their final resolution.

- 128. The Permittee shall prepare and distribute to all interested persons and parties. as shown on the interested parties list used by the Department of Regional Planning for this matter, and to any other person requesting to be added to the list, a guarterly newsletter, or electronic/social media, providing the Facility's website and its 24-hour hotline/emergency telephone numbers, and also providing the following information for the quarter: (1) "What is New" at the Facility; (2) the regulatory and permitting activities at the Facility; (3) the hotline/emergency log for the period; and (4) a summary of any and all progress reports and/or annual reports required by this grant. The newsletter shall be posted on the Facility's website and distributed to the Castaic library and other local libraries. In addition, the Permittee shall notify the Community Advisory Committee, as described in Part XI of the IMP, the Val Verde Community Advisory Committee, the Castaic Area Town Council Association, and any other interested community groups in the immediate vicinity of the Facility, of any significant operational change at the Facility.
- 129. Within 180 days after the Effective Date, the Permittee shall update its website to provide general information to the community regarding the Facility's recycling activities/programs, environmental mitigation measures, frequently asked questions, a description of the Facility's operation, which may include video, a complaint resolution mechanism, recent Notices of Violation and how they were resolved, and any other pertinent information requested by the Department of Public Works for the life of this grant.

### OAK TREE PERMIT SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

- 130. This grant, OAK 201500007, shall authorize the removal of four (4) trees (# 1, 2, 3, and 89) of the oak genus *(Quercus agrifolia)* as shown on the site plan (OAK 201500007 Exhibit "A").
- 131. This permit (OAK 201500007) shall not be effective until a site plan (CUP 200400042 Exhibit "A") is approved for the construction of the proposed landfill facilities and associated grading, demonstrating the need to remove the said trees.
- 132. The Permittee shall provide mitigation trees of the Oak genus at a rate of two to one (2:1) for each tree removed for a total of eight (8) mitigation trees.
- 133. The Permittee shall plant one healthy acorn of the same species of oak (*Quercus sp.*) as the tree removed for each mitigation tree planted. The acorns shall be planted at the same time as and within the watering zone of each mitigation tree.
- 134. All replacement trees shall be planted on native undisturbed soil and shall be the same species of oak (*Quercus sp.*) as the removed tree. The location of the replacement tree shall be in the vicinity of other oak trees of the same species. A

layer of humus and litter from beneath the canopy of the removed tree shall also be applied to the area beneath the canopies of the replacement trees to further promote the establishment of mycorrhizae within their rooting zones.

- 135. When replacement trees are planted on disturbed soil or are not in the vicinity of the same species of oak (*Quercus sp.*) as the removed tree, planting shall incorporate a mycorrhizal product, either as amendment or in the first two irrigations or watering of planted trees (i.e. "mycorrhizaROOTS" or similar product) in accordance with the label's directions. A layer of humus and litter from beneath the canopy of the removed tree shall also be applied to the area beneath the canopies of the replacement trees to further promote the establishment of mycorrhizae within their rooting zones.
- 136. If any oak tree grows into ordinance size during the duration of this permit, removals, encroachments or any additional impacts shall be inclusive within this permit to ensure proper mitigation.

In addition to the work expressly allowed by this permit, remedial pruning intended to ensure the continued health of a protected oak tree or to improve its appearance or structure may be performed. Such pruning shall include the removal of deadwood and stubs and medium pruning of branches to two inches in diameter or less in accordance with the guidelines published by the National Arborist Association. Copies of these guidelines are available from the Forestry Division of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. In no case shall more than 20 percent of the tree canopy of any one tree be removed.

- 137. Except as otherwise expressly authorized by this grant, any remaining oak trees shall be maintained in accordance with the principles set forth in the publication, "Oak Trees: Care and Maintenance", prepared by the Forestry Division of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. A copy of the publication is enclosed with these conditions.
- 138. The Permittee shall comply with all conditions and requirements contained in the County Forester and Fire Warden, Forestry Division, letter dated January 24, 2017 (attached hereto), to the satisfaction of said Division, except as otherwise required by said Division.

Attachments:

Project Site Plan – Exhibit "A"

County Forester's Letter dated January 24, 2017

### PROJECT NO. R2004-00559-(5) CUP 200400042, OAK 201500007

62

Oak Trees: Care and Maintenance Guide Fire Department letter dated February 24, 2017

Department of Public Health letter dated February 23, 2017

Implementation and Monitoring Program (IMP)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

Tonnage Capacity Breakdown Table

Table for Fee Structures

Table for Monitoring Requirement and Frequency



# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

FIRE DEPARTMENT **1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE** LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294

DARYL L. OSBY FIRE CHIEF FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

January 24, 2017

Iris Chi, Planner Department of Regional Planning **Zoning Permits Section** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Ms. Chi:

OAK TREE PERMIT NUMBER 2015-00007 PROJECT NUMBER R2004-00559-(5) 29201 HENRY MAYO DRIVE, CASTAIC

We have reviewed the "Request for Oak Tree Permit #2015-00007." The project is located at 29201 Henry Mayo Drive in the unincorporated area of Castaic. The Oak Tree Report is accurate and complete as to the location, size, condition and species of the Oak trees on the site. The term "Oak Tree Report" refers to the document on file by sb horticulture, the consulting arborist, dated June 6, 2014.

### We recommend the following as conditions of approval:

# **OAK TREE PERMIT REQUIREMENTS:**

- 1. This grant shall not be effective until the permittee and the owner of the property involved (if other than the permittee), have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning their affidavit stating that they are aware of and agree to accept all conditions of this grant. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation or other entity making use of this grant.
- 2. The permittee shall, prior to commencement of the use authorized by this grant, deposit with the County of Los Angeles Fire Department a sum of \$300. Such fees shall be used to compensate the County Forester \$100 per inspection to cover expenses incurred while inspecting the project to determine the permittee's compliance with the conditions of

SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF

| AGOURA HILLS | CALABA |
|--------------|--------|
| ARTESIA      | CARSON |
| AZUSA        | CERRIT |
| BALDWIN PARK | CLAREN |
| BELL         | COMME  |
| BELL GARDENS | COVINA |
| BELLFLOWER   | CUDAHY |
| BRADBURY     |        |

A

ASAS DIAMOND BAR DUARTE ١N TOS EL MONTE MONT GARDENA ERCE GLENDORA HAWAIIAN GARDENS łΥ HAWTHORNE

HIDDEN HILLS HUNTINGTON PARK INDUSTRY INGLEWOOD IRWINDALE LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE LA HABRA

LA MIRADA LA PUENTE LAKEWOOD LANCASTER LAWNDALE LOMITA LYNWOOD

MALIBUL MAYWOOD NORWALK PALMDALE PALOS VERDES ESTATES PARAMOUNT **PICO RIVERA** 

POMONA RANCHO PALOS VERDES **ROLLING HILLS ROLLING HILLS ESTATES** ROSEMEAD SAN DIMAS SANTA CLARITA

SIGNAL HILL SOUTH EL MONTE SOUTH GATE TEMPLE CITY WALNUT WEST HOLLYWOOD WESTLAKE VILLAGE WHITTIER

Iris Chi, Planner January 24, 2017 Page 2

approval. The above fees provide for one (1) initial inspection prior to the commencement of construction and two (2) subsequent inspections until the conditions of approval have been met. The Director of Regional Planning and the County Forester shall retain the right to make regular and unannounced site inspections.

- 3. Before commencing work authorized or required by this grant, the consulting arborist shall submit a letter to the Director of Regional Planning and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department's Forestry Division stating that he or she has been retained by the permittee to perform or supervise the work, and that he or she agrees to report to the Director of Regional Planning and the County Forester, any failure to fully comply with the conditions of the grant. The arborist shall also submit a written report on permit compliance upon completion of the work required by this grant. The report shall include a diagram showing the exact number and location of all mitigation trees planted as well as planting dates.
- 4. The permittee shall arrange for the consulting arborist or a similarly qualified person to maintain all remaining Oak trees on the subject property that are within the zone of impact as determined by the County Forester for the life of the Oak Tree Permit or the Conditional Use Permit.
- 5. The permittee shall install temporary chainlink fencing, not less than four (4) feet in height, to secure the protected zone of all remaining Oak trees on site as necessary. The fencing shall be installed prior to grading or tree removal, and shall not be removed without approval of the County Forester. The term "protected zone" refers to the area extending five (5) feet beyond the dripline of the Oak tree (before pruning), or fifteen (15) feet from the trunk, whichever is greater.
- 6. Copies of the Oak Tree Report, Oak tree map, mitigation planting plan and conditions of approval shall be kept on the project site and available for review. All individuals associated with the project as it relates to the Oak resource shall be familiar with the Oak Tree Report, Oak tree map, mitigation planting plan and conditions of approval.

# PERMITTED OAK TREE REMOVAL:

- 7. This grant allows the removal of four trees the Oak genus, three (3) (<u>Quercus agrifolia</u>) and one (1) <u>Quercus lobata</u> identified as Tree Number 1, 2, 3, and 89 on the applicant's site plan and Oak Tree Report. Trenching, excavation, or clearance of vegetation within the protected zone of an Oak tree shall be accomplished by the use of hand tools or small hand-held power tools. Any major roots encountered shall be conserved and treated as recommended by the consulting arborist.
- 8. In addition to the work expressly allowed by this permit, remedial pruning intended to ensure the continued health of a protected Oak tree or to improve its appearance or structure may be performed. Such pruning shall include the removal of deadwood and stubs and medium pruning of branches two-inches in diameter or less in accordance with the guidelines published by the National Arborist Association. Copies of these guidelines

Iris Chi, Planner January 24, 2017 Page 3

are available from the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division. In no case shall more than 20% of the tree canopy of any one tree be removed.

9. Except as otherwise expressly authorized by this grant, the remaining Oak trees shall be maintained in accordance with the principles set forth in the publication, "<u>Oak Trees: Care</u> and Maintenance," prepared by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division. A copy of the publication is enclosed with these conditions.

### **MITIGATION TREES:**

- The permittee shall provide mitigation trees of the Oak genus at a rate of two to one (2:1) for each tree removed, Six (6) <u>Quercus agrifolia</u>, and two (2) <u>Quercus lobata</u>, for a total of eight (8) mitigation trees.
- 11. Each mitigation tree shall be at least a 15-gallon specimen in size and measure one (1) inch or more in diameter one (1) foot above the base. Free form trees with multiple stems are permissible provided the combined diameter of the two (2) largest stems of such trees measure a minimum of one (1) inch in diameter one (1) foot above the base.
- 12. Mitigation trees shall consist of indigenous varieties of <u>Quercus agrifolia</u> and <u>Quercus</u> <u>lobata</u>, grown from a local seed source.
- 13. Mitigation trees shall be planted within one (1) year of the permitted Oak tree removals. Mitigation trees shall be planted either on site or at an off-site location approved by the County Forester. Alternatively, a contribution to the County of Los Angeles Oak Forest Special Fund may be made in the amount equivalent to the Oak resource loss. The contribution shall be calculated by the consulting arborist and approved by the County Forester according to the most current edition of the International Society of Arboriculture's "Guide for Plant Appraisal."
- 14. The permittee shall properly maintain each mitigation tree and shall replace any tree failing to survive due to a lack of proper care and maintenance with a tree meeting the specifications set forth above. The two-year maintenance period will begin upon receipt of a letter from the permittee or consulting arborist to the Director of Regional Planning and the County Forester, indicating that the mitigation trees have been planted. The maintenance period of the trees failing to survive two (2) years will start anew with the new replacement trees. Subsequently, additional monitoring fees shall be required.
- 15. All mitigation Oak trees planted as a condition of this permit shall be protected in perpetuity by the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance once they have survived the required maintenance period.

# NON-PERMITTED ACTIONS AND VIOLATIONS:

- 16. Encroachment within the protected zone of any additional tree of the Oak genus on the project site is prohibited.
- 17. Should encroachment within the protected zone of any additional tree of the Oak genus on the project site not permitted by this grant result in its injury or death within two (2) years, the permittee shall be required to make a contribution to the Los Angeles County Oak Forest Special Fund in the amount equivalent to the Oak resource damage/loss. Said contribution shall be calculated by the consulting arborist and approved by the County Forester according to the most current edition of the International Society of Arboriculture's "Guide for Plant Appraisal."
- 18. No planting or irrigation system shall be installed within the dripline of any Oak tree that will be retained.
- 19. Utility trenches shall not be routed within the protected zone of an Oak tree unless the serving utility requires such locations.
- 20. Equipment, materials and vehicles shall not be stored, parked, or operated within the protected zone of any Oak tree. No temporary structures shall be placed within the protected zone of any Oak tree.
- 21. Violations of the conditions of this grant shall result in immediate work stoppage or in a notice of correction depending on the nature of the violation. A time frame within which deficiencies must be corrected will be indicated on the notice of correction.
- 22. Should any future inspection disclose that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be held financially responsible and shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division, for all enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance.

To schedule a County Forester inspection, please contact the Environmental Review Unit at (818) 890-5719.

If you have any additional questions, please contact this office at (818) 890-5758.

Very truly yours J. LOPEZ, ASSISTANT CHIEF, FORESTRY DIVISION PREVENTION SERVICES BUREAU JL:jl

Enclosure



This Oak Tree Care and Maintenance Guide offers basic information and practical guidelines aimed at the preservation and continued health and survival of oak trees in the residential landscape.

Increasing pressure for development is changing the oak woodland of Los Angeles County. Heritage oaks which once survived in open rolling hills are now being preserved or replanted and incorporated into the community.

How do we protect these trees during the planning and development process, and ensure their survival once they are in the home garden?

#### The Oak Tree

Oak Trees in the residential landscape often suffer decline and early death due to conditions that are easily preventable. Damage can often take years to become evident, and by the time the trees show obvious signs of disease it is usually too late to help.

Improper watering, especially during the hot summer months, and disturbance to critical root areas are most often the causes. This booklet will provide guidelines on where these critical areas lie and ways to avoid disturbing them, as well as information on long-term care and maintenance of both natural and planted oaks. Lists of additional resources for more information and demonstration areas to visit are also included.

# The Oak Tree Ordinance

The Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance has been established to recognize oak trees as significant historical, aesthetic, and ecological resources. The goal of the ordinance is to create favorable conditions for the preservation and propagation of this unique and threatened plant heritage. By making this part of the development process, healthy oak trees will be preserved and maintained.

The Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance applies to all unincorporated areas of the County. Individual cities may have their own ordinances, and their requirements may be different.

#### **Permit Requirements:**

Under the Los Angeles County Ordinance, a person shall not cut, destroy, remove, relocate, inflict damage, or encroach into the *protected zone* (see text) of any ordinance sized tree of the oak tree genus without first obtaining a permit.

Damage includes but is not limited to :

- Burning
- Application of toxic substances
- Pruning or cutting
- Trenching
- Excavating
- Paving
- Operation of machinery or
- equipment
- Changing the natural grade

Chapter 22.56.2050: Oak Tree Permit Regulations, Los Angeles County, Adopted: August 20, 1982. Amended: September 13, 1988.

For more information about the County Oak Tree Ordinance, visit the Forestry Division's website at:

http://lacofd.org/Forestry\_folder/otordin.htm

Or contact:

# Department of Regional Planning

320 W. Temple Street, 13th floor Los Angeles, CA 90012-3284 (213) 974-6411 TDD: (213) 617-2292 http://planning.co.la.ca.us

# Types of oaks commonly found in Los Angeles County:

Many kinds of oak trees are native to Los Angeles County. A few of the more common ones are shown below, but *all* oak trees are covered by the Oak Tree Ordinance.

Older oaks which have thrived under the natural rainfall patterns of dry summers and wet winters often can't handle the extra water of a garden setting. These trees must be treated with special care if they are to survive.

Those oaks that have been planted into the landscape or sprouted naturally tend to be more tolerant of watered landscapes. These vigorous young trees may grow  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 4 feet a year in height under good conditions. Once established these trees would benefit from the same special care outlined in this guide.



QUERCUS LOBATA

LARGE DECIDUOUS TREE 60-75' HIGH, BROADLY SPREADING 50-80' WIDE.

LEAVES : DEEP GREEN , 3-4" LONG : PAPER LIKE TEXTURE WITH DEEP ROUNDED LOBES ON THE LEAF EDGE.

TENDS TO FAVOR VALLEY BOTTOMS : FOR THIS REASON THE VALLEY OAK HAS DISAPPEARED FROM THE LANDSCAPE MORE RAPIDLY, IMPACTED SEVERLY BY AGRICULTURE and URBAN DEVELOPMENT.



Coast Lire Oak

QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA

LARGE EVERGREEN TREE WITH A BROAD, ROUND SHAPE AND LARGE LIMBS. 30'-70' HIGH, 35'-80' WIDE.

LEAVES : GLOSSY GREEN , 1"-3" LONG 'SPINY, ROUNDED, AND HOLLY LIKE : BUT DISTINCTLY CUPPED OR CUPLED UNDER AT THE EDGES.



Interior Live Oak

QUERCUS WISLIZENII

EVERGREEN TREE 30-75' HIGH OR A SHRUB 8-10' HIGH IN CHAPARRAL AREAS. HAS A FULL, DENSE ROUNDED SHAPE, NOT BROAD OR WITH LARGE LIMBS LIKE A COAST LIVE OAK. THEY TEND TO GROW IN CLUMPS RATHER THAN AS A SINGLE TREE.

LEAVES : DARK GREEN, 1"-4" LONG. EDGES EITHER SMOOTH OR SPINY, BUT ALWAYS FLAT- NOT CURLED UNDER.

#### OTHER COMMON OAKS :

CALIFORNIA BLACK OAK : QUERCUS KELLOGGI CANYON LIVE OAK : QUERCUS CHRYSOLEPIS ENGELMANN OAK : QUERCUS ENGELMANNII

# THE PROTECTED ZONE

The *protected zone* defines the area most critical to the health and continued survival of an oak tree. Oaks are easily damaged and very sensitive to disturbances that occur to the tree or in the surrounding environment.

The root system is extensive but surprisingly shallow, sometimes radiating out as much as 50 feet beyond the spread of the tree leaves, or canopy. The ground area at the outside edge of the canopy, referred to as the *dripline*, is especially important: the tree obtains most of its surface water and nutrients here, and conducts an important exchange of air and other gases.

The protected zone is defined in the Oak Tree Ordinance as follows:

"The Protected Zone shall mean that area within the dripline of an oak tree and extending there from to a point at least 5 feet outside the dripline or 15 feet from the trunk, whichever distance is greater."



# CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY WITHIN THE PROTECTED ZONE

#### Changes in Grade

Any change in the level of soil around an oak tree can have a negative impact. The most critical area lies within 6' to 10' of the trunk: no soil should be added or scraped away. Water should drain away from this area and not be allowed to pond so that soil remains wet at the base.

Retaining walls designed to hold back soil above or below an existing tree should avoided if at all possible, especially within the protected zone. These types of structures cause critical areas at the dripline to be buried, or require that major roots be severed. Water trapped at the base of the tree could lead to root rot or other impacts, and to the decline and premature death of a highly valued landscape tree.

Construction activities outside the protected zone can have damaging impacts on existing trees. Underground water sources can be cut off due to falling water tables, or drainage may be disrupted.

### Trenching

Digging of trenches in the root zone should be avoided. Roots may be cut or severely damaged, and the tree can be killed.

If trenches <u>must</u> be placed within the protected zone, utilities can be placed in a conduit, which has been bored through the soil, reducing damage to the roots. Insist that as many utilities as allowed be placed in a single trench, instead of the common practice of digging a separate trench for each individual line.

Trenching can also be accomplished using hand tools or small hand held power equipment to avoid cutting roots. Any roots exposed during this work should be covered with wet burlap and kept moist until the soil can be replaced.

#### **Soil Compaction and Paving**

The roots depend upon an important exchange of both water <u>and</u> air through the soil within the protected zone. Any kind of activity that compacts the soil in this area blocks this exchange and can have serious long-term negative effects on the tree.

If paving material must be used, some recommended surfaces include brick paving with sand joints, or ground coverings such as wood chips (note the advantages of natural materials for providing nutrients under *mulching*).

# SOIL COMPACTION



TRENCHING



# MAINTENANCE

### Watering

The key is prevention – **do not over water**. Improper watering is often overlooked as the cause of tree death because it can take years for the damage to show. Once the tree shows obvious signs of decline, it is often too late to correct the problem.

The seasonal weather pattern for this region is one of dry summers and winter rain. Oak trees are naturally drought tolerant and adapted to this cycle. If the tree is vigorous and thriving it should not require **any** additional water.

If the natural source of surface or underground water has been altered, some supplemental water <u>may</u> be necessary, but proceed with caution. The goal of any watering schedule for oak trees should be to supplement natural rainfall and it should occur only when the tree would normally receive moisture. This might be in the winter, if rains are unusually late, or in spring if rainfall has been below normal levels.

Over watering, especially during the summer months, causes a number of problems which can lead to decline and eventual death of the tree. It creates ideal conditions for attacks of Oak Root Fungus by allowing the fungus to breed all year. In addition, both evergreen and deciduous oaks grow vigorously in the spring and naturally go dormant in the summer. Extra water only encourages new tip growth which is subject to mildew. Oaks need this period of rest.

Newly planted oaks may need supplemental watering during their first few summers. After they become established water should be applied according to the previous guidelines.

### Pruning

For oak trees the periodic removal of dead wood during periods of tree dormancy should be the only pruning needed. Any cutting of green wood opens scars that could allow the entry of organisms or disease.

Before pruning obtain the advice of a certified arborist or other professional and consult the local city or county where the tree is located to find out what regulations apply. Pruning of both live and dead wood can sometimes require a permit.

### Mulching

Leaf litter from the tree is the best mulch and should be allowed to remain on the ground within the protected zone. Crushed walnut shells or wood chips can be used, but the oak leaves that drop naturally provide the tree with a source of nutrients. Avoid the use of packaged or commercial oak leaf mulch which could contain Oak Root Fungus. Redwood chips should not be used due to certain chemicals present in the wood.



### Disease and Pests

Trees that are stressed, especially because of improper watering practices, are prone to certain diseases and attacks by pests.

The most damaging of these diseases is the Oak Root Fungus Armillaria mellea. Occurring naturally in the soil, the fungus thrives under wet conditions and dies back in the summer when soils dry out. This is why summer watering of oaks can be a deadly practice. As noted in the watering guidelines, wet soil in the summer allows the fungus to grow all year. As the population grows, their natural food sources are depleted and they begin feeding on oak tree roots. The fungus does not require an open wound in the tree to gain entry.

Indications of the fungus include:

- die back of branches or tips.
- honey colored fungus at or near the root crown.
- white fan-like fungus between wood and bark.
- the presence of black, shoestring-like growths in the soil.

Once the tree begins to show obvious signs of infection treatment is generally ineffective. The best treatment is to *avoid* the conditions that lead to Oak Root Fungus infections.

Pit Scale, Oak Moth, and other pests: any significant changes in leaf color, branch die back, presence of black sooty materials on leaves or other changes should be noted. Seek the advice of a professional forester, arborist, farm advisor or other expert before the application of any pesticides on an oak tree.

## Planting Underneath Oaks

The natural leaf litter is by far the best ground cover within the protected zone. If plants must be placed, the following guidelines should be followed:

There should be <u>no</u> planting within a minimum 6 to 10 feet of the trunk.

Avoid plants that require <u>any</u> supplemental water once established.

Choose plants suited for "dry shade." Those listed in the box below offer some good choices. To see some examples of how these plants have been used under oaks refer to the Additional Resources section on the following page.

### PLANTS TO CONSIDER:

| Plant Name  | Description  |
|---|--|
| <i>Arctostaphylos densiflora</i><br>'Howard McMinn' Manzanita | 3' high, 6' wide. Toughest of available forms.<br>Whitish-pink flowers.        |
| <i>Arctostaphylos edmundsii</i><br>Little Sur Manzanita       | 1-2' high, 4-5' wide. Tolerant of full shade.                                  |
| <i>Arctostaphylos hookeri</i><br>Monterey Carpet Manzanita    | 1-2' high, spreading to 12' wide by rooting branches. White to pink flowers.   |
| <i>Ceanothus griseus horizontalis</i><br>Carmel Creeper       | Less than 2 1/2' tall, low & creeping.<br>Clusters of small blue flowers.      |
| <i>Heuchera spp.</i><br>Coral Bells                           | 2-4' mound. Flowers on an upright stem 2-3" high and spotted with red or pink. |
| <i>Mahonia aquifolium compacta</i><br>Oregon Grape            | 2-4' high, spreading by underground roots.<br>Bright yellow flower clusters.   |
| <i>Ribes viburnifolium</i><br>Evergreen or Catalina Currant   | 2-3' high, spreading to 12' wide. Flowers pink to red in small clusters.       |

#### NOTES:

Before deciding on plants, check a source such as the <u>Sunset Western</u> <u>Garden Book</u> to determine which plants will grow in your area.

When choosing shade tolerant plants, consider that the ground under the south side of the tree will get more sunlight while the northern side will tend to remain more deeply shaded.

# **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES and Places to Visit**

#### **Public Agencies**

#### County of Los Angeles Fire Department

Prevention Bureau, Forestry Division 5823 Rickenbacker Road, Rm #123 Commerce, CA 90040-3027 (323) 890-4330 http://lacofd.org/forestry.htm

#### University of California

Integrated Hardwood Range Management Program 163 Mulford Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720-3114 <u>http://danr.ucop.edu/ihrmp</u>

#### **Private Organizations**

#### The Theodore Payne Foundation

10459 Tuxford Street Sun Valley, CA 91352-2126 (818) 768-1802 www.theodorepayne.org

#### **California Native Plant Society**

1722 J Street, Suite 17 Sacramento, CA 95814-3033 (916) 447-2677 www.cnps.org

#### The California Oak Foundation

1212 Broadway, Suite 810 Oakland, CA 94612-1810 (510) 763-0282 www.californiaoaks.org

#### Arboretums and Botanic Gardens

#### Los Angeles County Arboreta and Botanic Gardens

301 N. Baldwin Ave. Arcadia, CA 91007-2697 (626) 821-3222 www.arboretum.org

#### Los Angeles County South Coast Botanic Garden 26300 Crenshaw Blvd. Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274-2515 (310) 544-6815

www.southcoastbotanicgarden.org

#### Los Angeles County Descanso Gardens 1418 Descanso Drive

La Canada-Flintridge, CA 91011-3102 (818) 949-4200 www.descansogardens.org

# Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden

1500 North College Claremont, CA 91711-3157 (909) 625-8767 www.rsabg.org

# **The Lummis Home** 200 E. Avenue 43

Los Angeles, CA 90031-1304 (213) 222-0546

### Publications

<u>Compatible Plants Under and Around Oaks</u>. Bruce W. Hagen... [et al]. The California Oak Foundation. 2000.

Growing California Native Plants. Marjorie G. Schmidt, Univ. California Press. 1981.

<u>Illustrated Guide to the Oaks of the Southern Californian Floristic Province</u>. Fred M. Roberts. FM Roberts Publications. 1996.

*Living Among the Oaks: A Management Guide for Landowners*. University of California Integrated Range Management Program. 1995.

Oaks of California. Bruce M. Pavlik...[et al]. Cachuma Press & the California Oak Foundation. 1995.

<u>Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium on Oak Woodlands: Oaks in California's Changing Landscape</u>. GTR PSW-GTR-184. Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2001. Available from the University of California Integrated Hardwood Range Management Program.

<u>Regenerating Rangeland Oaks in California</u>. University of California Integrated Range Management Program. 2001.



# County of Los Angeles Fire Department Forestry Division

County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors

Gloria Molina, First District Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Second District Zev Yaroslavsky, Third District Don Knabe, Fourth District Michael D. Antonovich, Fifth District

# **County of Los Angeles Fire Department**

P. Michael Freeman, Fire Chief

Brush Clearance Unit 605 N. Angeleno Avenue Azusa, CA 91702-2904 (626) 969-2375

Camp 17 6555 Stephens Ranch Road La Verne, CA 91750-1144 (909) 593-7147

Environmental Review Unit 12605 Osborne Street Pacoima, CA 91331-2129 (818) 890-5719

Fire Plan/Interpretive Unit 12605 Osborne Street Pacoima, CA 91331-2129 (818) 890-5783

Fuel Modification Unit 605 N. Angeleno Avenue Azusa, CA 91702-2904 (626) 969-5205

Henninger Flats Forestry Unit 2260 Pinecrest Drive Altadena, CA 91001-2123 (626) 794-0675 Lake Hughes Forestry Unit 42150 N. Lake Hughes Road Lake Hughes, CA 93532-9706 (661) 724-1810

Malibu Forestry Unit 942 N. Las Virgenes Road Calabasas, CA 91302-2137 (818) 222-1108

San Dimas Forestry Unit 1910 N. Sycamore Canyon Road San Dimas, CA 91773-1220 (909) 599-4615

Saugus Forestry Unit 28760 N. Bouquet Canyon Road Saugus, CA 91390-1220 (661) 296-8558

Vegetation Management Unit 12605 Osborne Street Pacoima, CA 91331-2129 (818) 890-5720



FIRE PREVENTION DIVISION

Land Development Unit 5823 Rickenbacker Road Commerce, CA 90040 Telephone (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783

PROJECT: R2004-00559

MAP DATE: 05/01/2015

LOCATION: 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Castaic

PLANNER: Richard Claghorn

**REVISED CONDITIONS: Supersedes Fire Dept. Conditions Dated 02/22/2017** 

THE FIRE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDS CLEARANCE OF THIS PROJECT TO PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING AS PRESENTLY SUBMITTED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.

# **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL - ACCESS**

- 1. Fire Apparatus Access Road must be installed and maintained in a serviceable manner prior to and during the time of construction. Fire Code 501.4
- 2. All fire lanes shall be clear of all encroachments, and shall be maintained in accordance with the Title 32, County of Los Angeles Fire Code.
- 3. The Fire Apparatus Access Roads and designated fire lanes shall be measured from flow line to flow line.
- 4. In the locations noted on the site plan, provide a minimum unobstructed width of 20 feet, exclusive of shoulders and an unobstructed vertical clearance "clear to sky" Fire Apparatus Access Roads Fire Code 503.1.1 & 503.2.1
- 5. Provide a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet, exclusive of shoulders and an unobstructed vertical clearance "clear to sky" Fire Apparatus Access Road to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building. Fire Code 503.1.1 & 503.2.2
- 6. The dimensions of the approved Fire Apparatus Access Roads shall be maintained as originally approved by the fire code official. Fire Code 503.2.2.1
- 7. Dead-end Fire Apparatus Access Roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved Fire Department turnaround. Fire Code 503.2.5
- 8. Fire Apparatus Access Roads shall be provided with a 32 foot centerline turning radius. Fire Code 503.2.4

Reviewed by: Wally Collins

Date: February 24, 2017



FIRE PREVENTION DIVISION

Land Development Unit 5823 Rickenbacker Road Commerce, CA 90040 Telephone (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783

PROJECT: R2004-00559

MAP DATE: 05/01/2015

LOCATION: 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Castaic

PLANNER: Richard Claghorn

- 9. A minimum 5 foot wide approved firefighter access walkway leading from the fire department access road to all required openings in the building's exterior walls shall be provided for firefighting and rescue purposes. Fire Code 504.1
- 10. Approved building address numbers, building numbers or approved building identification shall be provided and maintained so as to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property. The numbers shall contrast with their background, be Arabic numerals or alphabet letters, and be a minimum of 4 inches high with a minimum stroke width of 0.5 inch. Fire Code 505.1
- 11. Gate Requirements: Provide gate access as noted on the February 24, 2017 "Fire Apparatus Access Plan".
  - a. When security gates are provided, maintain a minimum access width of the access road. The security gate shall be provided with an approved means of emergency operation, and shall be maintained operational at all times and replaced or repaired when defective. Electric gate operators, where provided, shall be listed in accordance with UL 325. Gates intended for automatic operation shall be designed, constructed and installed to comply with the requirements of ASTM F220. Gates shall be of the swinging or sliding type. Construction of gates shall be of materials that allow manual operation by one person. Fire Code 503.6
  - b. All locking devices shall comply with the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Regulation 5, Compliance for Installation of Emergency Access Devices.

# **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – WATER**

1. The closest public water system exceeds 2000 feet from the project site. In lieu of a public water system, a water tank is allowed to provide water for fire protection. The size of the water tank and the location of the on-site fire hydrants will be determined during the building plan check process.



FIRE PREVENTION DIVISION

Land Development Unit 5823 Rickenbacker Road Commerce, CA 90040 Telephone (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783

PROJECT: R2004-00559

MAP DATE: 05/01/2015

LOCATION: 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Castaic

PLANNER: Richard Claghorn

- 2. All fire hydrants shall measure 6"x 4"x 2-1/2" brass or bronze, conforming to current AWWA standard C503 or approved equal, and shall be installed in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Regulation 8.
- 3. All on-site fire hydrants shall be installed a minimum of 25' feet from a structure or protected by a two (2) hour rated firewall. Fire Code Appendix C106

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ACCESS– LANDFILL (Fire Department Regulation 10)

- 1. Approved access roads shall be provided and maintained at all times around the dumping areas, and all existing and proposed buildings to access for firefighting equipment as addressed in the Fire Code Section 503.
- 2. Fire Apparatus Access Roads shall have an unobstructed width not less than 20 feet and an unobstructed vertical clearance clear to the sky.
- 3. Fire Apparatus Access Road widths may be increased, in the opinion of the chief, when the widths are not adequate enough to provide fire apparatus access. The increase in the fire apparatus access road width may be applied for future buildings.
- 4. Entrances to roads, trails or other access ways that have been closed with gates and barriers shall not be obstructed by parked vehicles.
- 5. Weeds, grass and combustible vegetation shall be removed for a distance of 10 feet on both sides of all access roads by rubbish trucks or the public.

# Additional Landfill Requirements:

1. A firebreak or clearance of al dry weeds and grass shall be provided around the dumping areas. Secondary firebreaks, as required by the Fire Department, shall be provided and maintained in order to prevent the spread of the fire beyond the dump facility. The secondary firebreaks shall be not less than 60 feet in width.



FIRE PREVENTION DIVISION

Land Development Unit 5823 Rickenbacker Road Commerce, CA 90040 Telephone (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783

PROJECT: R2004-00559

MAP DATE: 05/01/2015

LOCATION: 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Castaic

PLANNER: Richard Claghorn

- 2. The property shall be adequately fenced to prevent entry of unauthorized persons, and gates shall be locked at all times when the facility is not supervised. An attendant shall be on duty when the site is open to the public.
- 3. **"NO SMOKING"** signs shall be posted on the facility and at all entrances to the facility. Smoking regulations, as required by this Department, will be strictly enforced.
- 4. Dumping operations shall be carried on in such a manner as to minimize the possibility of fires occurring in the waste material. The waste material which is dumped on the premises shall be immediately mixed with earth, and under no circumstances shall any exposed surface or face of combustible materials be left uncovered at the close of daily operations.
- 5. Any fire which occurs on the premises shall be reported immediately to the Fire Department and it shall be the responsibility of the operator to immediately extinguish any such fire. A telephone shall be installed for the purpose of notifying the Fire Department in case of fire.
- 6. Provisions shall be made to control or prevent the blowing of papers or other combustibles water materials into the brush or outside the established dumping areas. The premises shall be kept free of any accumulations of waste combustible materials, which might constitute a fire menace.

### WATER SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS – LANDFILL (Fire Department Regulation 10)

- 1. A water supply shall be provided which meets the Fire Department standards as determined by the Land Development Unit of the Fire Prevention Division.
- 2. Adequate on-site fire hydrants shall be required per Fire Department standards. The future expansion of the facility should be considered when determining the size and placement of water mains and hydrants.



FIRE PREVENTION DIVISION

Land Development Unit 5823 Rickenbacker Road Commerce, CA 90040 Telephone (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783

PROJECT: R2004-00559

MAP DATE: 05/01/2015

LOCATION: 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Castaic

PLANNER: Richard Claghorn

- 3. A Class II Standpipe System shall be provided and located within 200 feet of dumping operations and shall have sufficient 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> -inch hose with a variable-fog nozzle to reach all portions of such operations.
- 4. In lieu of a Class II standpipe system, the use of water tender trucks may be permitted, provided each truck is equipped with 2½-inch outlets for fire department use.

# FUEL MODIFICATION

- 1. This property is located within the area described by the Fire Department as the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. A "Preliminary Fuel Modification Plan" shall be submitted and approved prior to public hearing. For details, please contact the Department's Fuel Modification Unit which is located at Fire Station 32, 605 North Angeleno Avenue in the City of Azusa CA 91702-2904. They may be reached at (626) 969-5205.
  - a. The Fuel Modification Unit received the "Preliminary Fuel Modification Plan" on February 23, 2017. The review of the "Preliminary Fuel Modification Plan is pending at this time. The "Final Fuel Modification Plan" shall be reviewed and approved by the Fuel Modification Unit prior to the issuance of building permits.

For any questions regarding the report, please contact FPEA Wally Collins at (323) 890-4243 or at Wally.Collins@fire.lacounty.gov.

# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES Public Health

BARBARA FERRER, Ph.D., M.P.H., M.Ed. Director

JEFFREY D. GUNZENHAUSER, M.D., M.P.H. Interim Health Officer

CYNTHIA A. HARDING, M.P.H. Chief Deputy Director

ANGELO J. BELLOMO, REHS, QEP Deputy Director for Health Protection

TERRI S. WILLIAMS, REHS Director of Environmental Health

BRENDA J. LOPEZ, REHS Assistant Director of Environmental Health

5050 Commerce Drive Baldwin Park, California 91706 TEL (626) 430-5100 • FAX (626) 813-3000 www.publichealth.lacounty.gov

#### February 23, 2017 **REVISED REPORT**

- TO: Richard Claghorn Principal Regional Planning Assistant Department of Regional Planning
- FROM: Jeanne Biehler, REHS Environmental Health Division Department of Public Health
- SUBJECT: CUP CONSULTATION PROJECT NO. R2004-00559 Chiquita Canyon Landfill 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Valencia

×

Public Health recommends approval of this CUP. Public Health does **NOT** recommend approval of this CUP.

The Department of Public Health has reviewed the information provided for the project identified above. The project proposal is to provide additional disposal capacity to help meet the critical waste management needs of the greater Los Angeles area.

The Department recommends approval of the CUP at this time, contingent upon all requirements of the Drinking Water Program being adequately addressed at the Building Permit stage as detailed in the Drinking Water Program section, below.

#### Solid Waste Management Program

#### The Solid Waste Management Program recommends approval of the CUP.

The Solid Waste Management Program acting as the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) for Chiquita Canyon Landfill has met with the project applicant group, and is in agreement with responses that will be provided in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

Should you have any questions or comments regarding the above statement, please feel free to contact Ms. Dorcas Hanson-Lugo at 626 430-5540 or at <u>dlugo@ph.lacounty.gov</u>.



**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS** 

Hilda L. Solis First District Mark Ridley-Thomas Second District Sheila Kuehl Third District Janice Hahn Fourth District Kathryn Barger Fifth District
#### **Drinking Water Program**

### The Drinking Water Program recommends approval of this CUP upon the satisfaction of conditions contained herein at the Building Permit stage:

The Drinking Water Program has reviewed the additional information, responses and Water Supply Assessments (WSA) regarding the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion. The WSA addresses the <u>non-potable water supply</u> increase in demand. It does not address the <u>potable</u> water supply demand for the project. Uniform Plumbing Code and State Water Codes specify potable water requirements for the drinking and sanitary facilities on the site. The WSA addresses the 150 AFY of <u>non-potable</u> water necessary for the expansion where 93 AFY is currently utilized. The WSA does not include potable water in its assessment but identifies that 100 GPD of potable water is utilized and fulfilled by supplying bottled water.

- As the WSA addresses the non-potable water demand only, please identify an approved safe and reliable source of potable water for the project. Bottled water does meet the demands and practicalities required by the sanitary infrastructure and the minimum safe drinking water standards for the project.
- Section 3363 Chapter 4 California Code of Regulations does not list bottled water as potable water. Section (a) states: "Potable water in adequate supply shall be provided in all places of employment for drinking and washing, and where required by the employer of these orders, for bathing, cooking, washing of food, washing of cooking and eating utensils, and washing of food preparation or processing premises, and personal service rooms," *Et. al.*
- The current description and information presented to this program regarding employee numbers is in excess of 25 persons. This requires the delivery of safe and reliable drinking water from an approved water system that is permitted, regulated and monitored per the California Safe Drinking Water Act for the users of the site. Please note that the reference of the Safe Drinking Water Act does not infer formation of a public water system.
- Please note this department's response is solely focused on the potable source(s) of water.

The Drinking Water Program proffered comments on September 29, 2015 and January 18, 2017. The following comments reflect additional information regarding the particulars for the potable water issues facing the project that will operate as a landfill and workplace for the next 30 years. The applicant must satisfy the following as they apply:

### *If there is an intent is to acquire a potable water service connection from the Valencia Water Company:*

 Provide a signed contract, proof of entitlement or will serve letter from the Valencia Water Company that guarantees an uninterruptable <u>potable</u> supply of water. If this is attainable, no further requirements are needed.

The current information provided within the WSA denotes that non-potable water is currently provided by Newhall Land and Farming Company (NLFC) irrigation well. The following only pertains if this well is to be, or can be utilized, for potable purposes. If such a potable option is attainable through the use of the existing NLFC well, it would therefore be subject to the California State Well Standards regarding construction conformance for potable water uses and its relation to the California Safe Drinking Water Act. The following 3 bullet points will be required if this is a solution but it is recognized from the review of information, that this is an unlikely option.

- Provide the construction details of the well(s) in addition to the California State Well Drillers Completion Report(s) for each well. Each well(s) shall be in conformance to the California State Well Standards.
- Denote well locations and distribution/plumbing system layout in a scaled map that exhibits well locations, valves, taps, pumps, booster pumps, pressure gauging, backflow valving, reservoirs, building connections, dust control irrigation, vegetation irrigation and treatmentdisinfection facilities where applicable. Also provide material detail or schedule for the above mentioned system components.
- Provide information or analysis of the California State Title 22 Code of Regulation regarding Primary and Secondary Drinking Water Quality Standards.

## For either option, an accurate assessment regarding potable water demand will need to be identified. Provide the following:

- Employee, consultant, visitor, customer, contractor, or user of the facility population numbers.
- The number of buildings that require water service for both sanitary and potable purposes.
- Information as to the acquisition of a safe, reliable, regulated and monitored source of water for the sanitary and potable facilities utilized by the transient and non-transient users of the site. This includes visitors, employees, and contractors. The use of the term transient and nontransient does not necessarily denote a requirement to form a public water system.

For questions regarding the above section's comments, please contact Vincent Gallegos or Lusi Mkhitaryan at Drinking Water Program at (626) 430-5420, or via email at vgallegos@ph.lacounty.gov or Imkhitaryan@ph.lacounty.gov.

#### Land Use Program

#### The Land Use program recommends approval of the CUP with the conditions stated below:

The Land Use program is issuing a conceptual approval for the installation of a future OWTS based on the feasibility report submitted by the applicant. This conceptual approval is subjected to the required approval from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to this program issuing an approval for the installation of the OWTS at Building Permit phase. Further review will need to be conducted as to size, capacity, etc. when the final design is submitted to this program.

If you have any questions regarding the above section, please contact Michelle Tsiebos at (626) 430-5380 or via e-mail at <u>mtsiebos@ph.lacounty.gov</u>.

#### Toxics Epidemiology Program

## The Toxics Epidemiology Program recommends approval of this CUP with the following recommendations and requirements:

Staff from Toxics Epidemiology Program has reviewed the documents and plans provided by the applicant. The following comments are presented after the site visit was conducted:

Noise

The noise that will be generated during construction, according to the environmental assessment section of the Initial Study, will not generate any significant impacts on the surrounding sensitive land use. No operational noise impacts are expected. We agree with the initial assessment.

#### Air Quality

Regarding fugitive dust emissions it is recommended that during the operational phase of the project, dust suppression engineering techniques be applied in order to minimize temporary increase in dust air emissions. Fugitive dust can result in public exposure to fungal spores such as *Coccidioides immitis*, which can cause Coccidioidomycosis (Valley Fever).

Additional odor mitigation measures should be investigated. Public Health classifies odor complaints as having significant negative health impacts on the public, that is to say that odor is more than a nuisance.

For questions regarding the above section, please contact Robert Vasquez or Evenor Masis at (213) 738-3220 or at <a href="mailto:rvasquez@ph.lacounty.gov">rvasquez@ph.lacounty.gov</a> and <a href="mailto:emassis@ph.lacounty.gov">emasis@ph.lacounty.gov</a>.

For any other questions regarding this report, please feel free to contact me at (626) 430-5382 or at <u>ibiehler@ph.lacounty.gov</u>.

#### **IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM**

#### CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION Attachment to the Conditions of Approval for Conditional Use Permit Number 200400042

<u>PURPOSE.</u> This implementation and monitoring program ("IMP") is intended to implement and ensure compliance with the conditions of Project No. R2004-00559 and its associated permits Conditional Use Permit No. 200400042 and Oak Tree Permit No. 201500007 ("Grant") and to complement the enforcement and monitoring programs routinely administered by County agencies and non-county public agencies during the life of the Grant. Unless otherwise defined in this IMP, terms herein shall have the same meaning as in the Conditions of Approval for the Grant.

<u>PART I — LANDFILL ELEVATIONS.</u> The following measures shall be carried out to monitor compliance with Condition Nos. 10, 23, 34, 35, 37, 40, 47, 49 and 84 of this Grant, which establish the Limits of Fill.

A. Before commencing expansion of the Landfill beyond the limits established by Conditional Use Permit No. 89-081, the Permittee shall install survey monuments around the perimeter of the Landfill, as depicted on Exhibit "A" and as established by the limits of Condition No. 27.

The specific spacing, location, and characteristics of the survey monuments shall be as specified by the Director of Public Works and shall be at points where they will not be subject to disturbance of Landfill development.

The survey monuments shall be inspected and approved by the Director of Public Works after installation, and the "as installed" plan shall be provided to the Director of Public Works.

Not less than 60 or more than 90 days before the deadline for the annual monitoring report required by Part XII of this IMP, the Permittee shall cause a licensed surveyor or registered civil engineer to conduct a survey of the Landfill's elevations and submit the results to the Director of Public Works for approval. Additional elevation surveys shall also be conducted by either of these professionals under the following circumstances: 1) in the event of an earthquake of magnitude (Richter) 5.0 or greater in the vicinity of the Facility; 2) as directed by the Director of Public Works as he or she deems necessary to monitor compliance with the conditions of approval of the Grant; or 3) upon completion of the Landfill's final fill design.

The Director of Public Works may also conduct or order on-site surveys as he or she deems necessary and shall promptly report any apparent violation revealed by the survey to the Director of the Department of Regional Planning and the DPH.

B. If the Director of Public Works approves grading or other disturbance in

areas outside the Limits of Fill shown on Exhibit "A" pursuant to Condition No. 49 of the Grant, the Department of Public Works shall provide a copy of such approval to the Director of the Department of Regional Planning.

<u>PART II — WASTE PLAN CONFORMANCE.</u> The provisions of this Part II are intended to ensure compliance with the provisions of Condition Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 41 and 42 of the Grant, and to conform Landfill operations with the Los Angeles County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan adopted pursuant to Division 30 of the Public Resources Code.

- A. The Permittee shall ensure the proper installation and maintenance of scales to verify the weight of Solid Waste received, disposed of, used for Beneficial Use Materials at the Facility, and/or otherwise diverted and sent off-site for further handling and/or processing. The Permittee shall maintain records necessary to document the following: (1) the aforementioned weights and their origin; (2) compliance with waste restrictions imposed pursuant to the conditions of the Grant; and (3) the fees charged for disposal at the Facility.
- B. All records shall be available for inspection by DPH, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Regional Planning, and the Treasurer and Tax Collector during normal business hours, and shall be forwarded to such agencies upon request.

<u>PART III – DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.</u> The provisions of this Part III are intended to enhance the continuing oversight of Landfill operations by reporting to the County all materials received, disposed, and beneficially used at the facility per the following.

- A. **Monthly.** Within 30 days after the end of each calendar month, Permittee shall submit the Monthly Report for that calendar month to the Department of Public Works in a form and manner determined by the Director of Public Works, including the following information:
  - a. The total number of commercial premises, multifamily premises, and residential premises, respectively, at which Permittee provided for regularly scheduled of Household Hazardous Waste collection or other measurement requested by County concerning these items;
  - b. The respective total quantities of:
    - i. Solid waste (in tons), Recyclables (in tons), and any green waste and other compostable organic materials (in tons or, if not weighed at the Solid Waste Facility where it is delivered, in tons); and Beneficial Use material (in tons or measure approved by the Director of the Department of Public Works) received by Permittee;
    - i. Materials recovered from those Recyclables, abandoned waste

(such as Certified Electronic Device (CED) or E-waste) and residual Solid Waste remaining after processing of Recyclables;

- c. The final destination of that residual Solid Waste;
- d. Where Permittee delivered those Recyclables; and
- e. Materials processed at the composting facility.
- f. The estimated number of holiday trees, and biomass received by Permittee and their final destination;
- g. Using reasonable business efforts, the estimated number and tons of bulky items, E-waste, and CEDs collected by Permittee (such as major appliances/white goods and metallic discards, used tires and other Solid Waste recovered by Permittee during any annual cleanup campaigns), and final destination thereof;
- h. The collection route maps and schedule for the entire service area, if any map or schedule has changed during the prior month;
- i. Any other information compiled from records or formatting of that information requested by the Director of Public Works;
- j. Number of vehicle loads of all vehicles coming to the facility; and
- k Records of material received and processed at the composting facility.

<u>PART IV — WASTE ORIGIN DATA ACCURACY.</u> The provisions of this Part IV are intended to ensure compliance with the provisions of Condition No.21 of the Grant. The Permittee shall adopt measures at the Facility to ensure the accuracy of the Solid Waste quantity allocated to County unincorporated areas and each of the cities from which waste is received. These measures shall also ensure the accuracy of determining the waste attributable to the Santa Clarita Valley Area, each city within Los Angeles County, and sources outside Los Angeles County; for purposes of complying with Condition No. 115 of the Grant. These measures shall become effective upon the Effective Date. Under these measures:

- A. The Permittee shall require written and verifiable documentation on source jurisdiction(s) and site address(es) where the Solid Waste is generated for loads from waste hauling industry customers ("Direct Haul Loads"), and written and verifiable documentation on source jurisdiction(s) for loads from transfer/processing facilities ("Transfer/Processing Loads"), the documentation of which shall be in a form developed by the Department of Public Works and distributed by the Permittee to its customers;
- B. The Permittee shall exempt from such documentation all customers tendering a minimum load, defined as a load having a net weight of less than one ton. However, such customers shall be required to verbally

state the source of their loads; and the Permittee shall record this information for its records and include in its reports;

- C. The Permittee shall investigate and verify the accuracy of all documentation provided for Direct Haul Loads;
- D. The Permittee shall forward all documentation for Transfer/Processing Loads to the Department of Public Works for review and verification;
- E. The Permittee shall forward all source of origin documentation for Direct Haul Loads from Solid Waste enterprises/waste haulers owned and operated by the Permittee or its subsidiaries to the Department of Public Works for review and verification;
- F. The Permittee shall impose a fee in an amount to be determined by the Permittee in consultation with the Department of Public Works on Direct Haul Loads and self-haul loads that are tendered at the Facility without the required written documentation. The fee shall be non-refundable and shall offset the Permittee's cost to track non-complying loads and to follow-up with the customers involved;
- G. If the Director of Public Works determines that a Solid Waste enterprise, waste hauler, and/or Transfer/Processing operator has failed to substantiate the origin of the Solid Waste, the Department of Public Works shall notify and direct the Permittee to impose a non-refundable penalty of \$5.00 per ton of waste whose origin the solid waste enterprise, waste hauler, or Transfer/Processing operator has failed to substantiate for that reporting period, which reporting period shall not exceed one month. The Permittee shall be responsible for collecting the fine and submitting it to the Department of Public Works within 60 days following such notification. The fines received by the Department of Public Works shall offset the cost of administering the waste origin verification program and of implementing other programs to mitigate any costs or penalties the County incur under the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, as amended, from such misallocation;
- H. Unless otherwise approved by the Director of Public Works, the Permittee shall suspend the disposal privileges of customers who fail to provide the written documentation required by this Part IV within 14 calendar days following the tendering of an applicable load at the Facility, or of those customers who provide false, misleading, or inaccurate written documentation. Each suspension shall last up to 60 days;
- I. The Permittee shall extend the suspension period set forth above and in appropriate circumstances terminate the customer's disposal privileges for Transfer/Processing operators or waste haulers that repeatedly fail to substantiate the origin of their waste loads as required in this Part IV, or who

fail to pay the required penalties;

- J. The Permittee shall provide a procedure for its customers to appeal the suspension to the Permittee, the Director of Public Works, or their designees, pursuant to this Part IV and for immediate reinstatement of such privileges if the appeal is successful; and
- K. If the Permittee or the Director of Public Works determines that the origin of a waste load has been incorrectly reported, the Permittee shall correct the data submitted to the disposal reporting system to ensure its accuracy.

Prior to the implementation of the above measures, the Permittee shall, subject to the approval of the Director of Public Works, develop a waste origin verification and reporting program to include, but not be limited to, an outreach program to educate all customers of the Facility regarding the need to provide waste origin information, the requirements of the measures adopted pursuant to this Part IV, and an explanation of the consequences for failure to comply with the measures. After the effective date of the adopted measures, the Permittee shall provide a 90-day grace period to its customers prior to taking any enforcement action to provide time for customer education on these measures. Based on the initial results obtained from the verification and reporting program, these measures may be amended or modified by the Director of Public Works. The Director of Public Works shall have the discretion to terminate the verification and reporting program at any time.

Twice monthly, the Permittee shall submit the results of the verification and reporting program to the Director of Public Works, along with any other written documentation on the waste load transactions at the Facility.

<u>PART V — HAZARDOUS WASTE EXCLUSION.</u> This Part V ensures compliance with Condition No. 46 of the Grant regarding the exclusion of liquid, radioactive and hazardous waste from the Facility.

The Permittee shall maintain a comprehensive waste load checking program which shall require that:

- A. All waste hauling vehicles shall be screened at the scales with a radiation detector device, acceptable to DPH, for the presence of radioactive materials;
- B. Sensors capable of detecting volatile organic compounds acceptable to DPH shall be available at the Facility and used as directed by DPH;
- D. The scale operator shall question all drivers of suspect loads as to the source and nature of the loads, and shall inspect for contamination all large loads of earth brought into the Facility from areas not known to be free of contamination; The Landfill's Working Face areas shall be continuously inspected for hazardous and liquid waste, medical waste, and radioactive waste/materials. This inspection shall be accomplished by equipment operators and spotters who have been trained through an inspection

program approved by DPH;

- E. Unless otherwise specified by DPH or the Department of Public Works, the Permittee shall conduct at least six manual inspections of randomly selected incoming loads each operating day, for a minimum of 36 inspections per week. In addition, the Permittee shall conduct a series of twelve, intensive unannounced manual inspections of loads over a twelve-month period during the life of the Grant; and
- F. If on the basis of above-described inspections, DPH or the Department of Public Works determines that significant amounts of prohibited waste are entering the Facility, DPH or the Department of Public Works may require an expanded inspection program, which may include additional, unannounced manual inspections.

<u>PART VI — PROHIBITED MATERIALS.</u> This Part VI ensures compliance with Condition Nos. 46, 47, and 48 of the Grant regarding the prohibited materials at the Facility.

The Permittee shall not receive, process, or dispose any of the prohibited waste at the Facility per the followings:

- A. Automobile shredder waste;
- B. Biosolid; Sludge or sewage sludge, as specified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 27, Division 2, Chapter 3, Article 1, Section 20690(b)(4), and any amendments thereto;
- C. Incinerator ash; radioactive material; hazardous waste, as defined in Title 22, Section 66261.3 of the California Code of Regulations; medical waste, as defined in Section 117690 of the California Health & Safety Code; liquid waste, as defined in Title 27, Section 20164 of the California Code of Regulations; and
- D. Waste that contains soluble pollutants in concentrations that exceed applicable water quality objectives; and waste that can cause degradation of waters in the State, as determined by the RWQCB.

The Permittee shall implement a comprehensive Waste Load Checking Program, approved by the Department of Public Works and DPH to preclude receipt or disposal of prohibited waste at the Landfill.

<u>PART VII — INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT</u>. Prior to the Effective Date, the Permittee shall enter into an agreement with the County to indemnify the County for any damages to public property which may result from Landfill operations and for any liability, loss, or expense incurred by the county as a result of its issuance of the Grant of the Permittee's violation thereof, or for any expense which may be incurred by the County in performing any on- and/or off-site remedial work necessitated by the Permittee's failure to operate or maintain the Facility at a level acceptable to the Director of Public Works or DPH, or for the Permittee's failure to perform any of this work in a timely manner, including but not limited to, work related to the Environmental Protection and Control Systems, air quality and odor, and litter and dust control, noise control, vector control, and maintenance of slopes. The standards for operation and maintenance shall be as established by the provisions of the Grant and all applicable laws and implementing regulations.

To secure performance of the agreement, the Permittee shall tender to the Director of Public Works a letter of credit or other security acceptable to the County in the amount of \$10 million.

The security shall be in addition to any and all other security required by federal, state and local law, regulations and permits, including the security requirements of the Grant and of the State landfill closure regulations.

<u>PART VIII</u> — <u>BIOLOGICAL/HORTICULTURAL</u> <u>MONITORING</u>. This Part VIII is intended to promote compliance with the provisions of Condition Nos. 59 and 60 of the Grant concerning on-site planting, revegetation, and maintenance.

A. On or before the Effective Date of the Grant, the Permittee shall retain a horticulture/forester consultant to supervise the on- and off-site slope planting and oak tree mitigation programs required by the Grant and this IMP. The consultant shall be approved by the County Forester.

This consultant shall have the requisite education, training, experience, and professional standing to carry out the specific requirements of the position, as evidenced by appropriate licensing, registration and/or academic standing in the field of horticulture/forestry.

In addition to the horticulture/forester consultant, prior to the Effective Date of the Grant, the Permittee shall retain the services of a biology consultant, whose duties shall include: (a) the ongoing review of any updated listings of threatened and endangered species contained in the Federal Register for purposes of determining whether species existing at the Facility have been re-classified with a "Category 1" status; (b) notification of the Department of any change in status of any such species; and (c) participating in the revegetation program adopted for the Landfill.

This consultant shall have the requisite education, training, experience and professional standing to carry out the specific requirements of the position, as evidenced by appropriate licensing, registration and/or academic

standing in the field of biology.

B. If any retained consultant pursuant to this Part VIII terminates employment at any time during the life of the Grant, including during the Post Closure Maintenance Period, a replacement consultant shall be retained and approved as provided in this Part VIII.

The Permittee shall create and maintain adequate records to track fill areas in accordance with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. These records shall indicate fill areas transferred to an inactive status which are potentially subject to the vegetation requirements in Condition Nos. 59 and 60. The Permittee shall make copies of such records available to the horticulture/forester consultant, DPH, the County Forester, and other interested regulatory agencies, when a Landfill area becomes inactive.

<u>PART IX — ARCHEOLOGICAL/PALEONTOLOGICAL MONITORING.</u> The Permittee shall implement the monitoring program described in this Part IX to conserve archaeological and paleontological resources as required by Condition No. 93 of the Grant.

- A. Before commencing grading activities in previously undisturbed areas, the Permittee shall nominate to the Director of the Department of Regional Planning, both a certified archaeologist and a qualified paleontologist from the Society of Professional Archaeologists which the Permittee intends to retain to perform the monitoring and conservation work required by this Part IX and Condition No. 93 of the Grant. If approved by the Director of the Department of Regional Planning, the archaeologist and paleontologist shall both submit a letter to the Director of the Department of Regional Planning stating that he/she has been retained to perform or supervise the work described herein, and that he/she agrees to report any failure of compliance with the Grant or this Part IX to the Director of Regional Planning.
- B. The archaeologist and the paleontologist shall each submit a written report to the Permittee to be included in the Permittee's annual monitoring report required by Part XIII of this IMP for as long as on-site excavation activity continues at the Facility.
- C. If either the archaeologist or paleontologist terminates employment before completion of the excavation work associated with the Facility, a replacement expert shall be selected, approved, retained and certified as described in this Part IX.

<u>PART X — ANCILLARY FACILITIES.</u> This Part X is intended to enhance compliance with Condition No. 24 of the Grant concerning the Ancillary Facilities at the Facility, and to verify that such Ancillary Facilities are consistent with the other conditions of the Grant and with the provisions of Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Zoning Ordinance").

Before commencing development or obtaining a building permit for any Ancillary Facility, the Permittee shall submit to the Director of the Department of Regional Planning a site plan for such Ancillary Facility. The plan shall be in sufficient detail to establish compliance with the conditions of the Grant and with the standards of the County Zoning Ordinance, including the provisions relating to the development and maintenance of parking, screening and signs, as set forth in Chapter 52 of the County Zoning Ordinance.

<u>PART XI — COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.</u> The Community Advisory Committee ("CAC"), appointed by the Board in connection with the previous Conditional Use Permit No. 89-081-(5) shall continue to serve as a liaison between the Permittee and the community, and as a conduit for the community to communicate with the Commission and other regulatory agencies on an ongoing basis regarding issues involving the development and operation of the Facility. The CAC shall be composed of persons who reside in the Santa Clarita Valley and who are recommended by recognized community and neighborhood associations. The Fifth Supervisorial District shall also appoint a representative to serve as a coordinator for the CAC and shall appoint a member.

For the life of the Grant, the Permittee shall continue to do the following regarding the CAC:

- A. Provide qualified personnel to regularly attend CAC meetings;
- B. Provide the CAC reasonable access to the Facility and information concerning Landfill operations necessary for the CAC to perform its functions;
- C. Provide accommodations for CAC meetings of Val Verde, Castaic, and other communities surrounding the Landfill; and
- D. Provide funding, not to exceed \$20,000 per annum, for the CAC to retain independent consultants for CAC-related matters; provided that all consultants shall have the requisite education, training, and experience to undertake the work and shall have no conflict of interest with the Permittee or any member of the CAC.

The CAC shall be provided access to all reports submitted by the Permittee to any and all regulatory agencies required under the Grant, including the annual monitoring report required by Part XII of this IMP. The Permittee shall also consult the CAC on planning matters that could affect the physical development, closure date, or future use of the Facility.

<u>PART XII — ANNUAL MONITORING REPORTS.</u> This Part XII is intended to enhance the continuing oversight of Landfill operations and to supplement the routine enforcement activities of the various regulatory agencies having jurisdiction over the development, operation, and maintenance of the Facility.

A. By March 1 of each year until the Landfill's Closure, the Permittee shall prepare and submit annual monitoring reports to the Commission and

Technical Advisory Committee (which is described in Part XIV of this IMP). At least 90 days prior to that date, draft copies of the report shall be submitted to the following entities for review and comment:

- 1. DPH;
- 2. Director of the Department;
- 3. Director of Public Works;
- 4. Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden;
- 5. Regional Water Quality Control Board-Los Angeles Region;
- 6. South Coast Air Quality Management District;
- 7. County Museum of Natural History; and
- 8. Community Advisory Committee;

The draft submittal to the above-referenced entities shall include a request that comments be sent to the Permittee within 30 days of receipt of the draft report, but no later than 30 days prior to the deadline for the final report. The Permittee shall provide documentation and certification to the Director of the Department of Regional Planning that the draft reports have been submitted to these entities and the agencies comments and proposal revisions have been fully incorporated in to the final report.

The Permittee shall respond to each comment received by these entities and shall include every comment and response with the final report submitted to the Commission and the Technical Advisory Committee. A copy of the final report shall be provided to the local county library and posted on the Permittee's website.

Upon receipt of the monitoring report, the Commission and Technical Advisory Committee may request the Permittee to submit additional information as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this IMP.

- B. Each monitoring report shall contain, at a minimum, the following:
  - A cumulative total of all Solid Waste disposed of, and Beneficial Use Materials received at the Landfill, the percent of total available capacity used, the remaining disposal capacity in volume and in tons, and a detailed site map/plan showing the sequence of Landfill operations;
  - A copy (which may be reduced and simplified to fit the report format) of the most recent approved Landfill survey (as required in Part I of this IMP) showing the Limits of the Fill, current elevations, and the height and extent of the current fill;
  - 3. The achieved ratio of weight to volume of Solid Waste disposed of

at the Landfill and a comparison of that ratio with the ratio achieved at comparable landfills in the County, with an explanation of any significant deviation;

- 4. A summary table of the rates (quantity per month and per calendar year) of materials received, disposed of, used for Beneficial Use Materials at the Facility, and/or otherwise diverted and/or sent off-site for further handling/processing, for the period established by the Director of Public Works, or from the last monitoring report, in sufficient detail to explain significant changes and variations of the rates over time;
- 5. A summary of the measures taken by the Permittee to divert and recycle materials at the Facility, how the measures compare with waste management plans adopted by the County and various cities, and the overall effectiveness of such measures in achieving the intent of the Grant and the County's waste management plans;
- 6. A summary of the number and character of litter, noise, fugitive dust, and odor complaints received in the reporting period, the disposition of such complaints, and any new or additional measures taken to address or avoid future complaints;
- 7. A detailed accounting of any and all citations, notices of violation, or equivalent the Facility received from any regulatory agency for violations in operating the Facility (including violations related to litter, odor, fugitive dust, noise, Landfill gas, or other Environmental Protection and Control Systems), the disposition of the citations, and the penalties assessed and fees paid;
- 8. A report on all interim and final fill revegetation, including an assessment of the success of such revegetation and any additional measures necessary or proposed to effect successful revegetation;
- 9. The archaeological and paleontological reports required in Part XII;
- 10. A summary of the measures taken by the Permittee to promote and implement alternative technologies most appropriate for Southern California from an environmental and economic perspective, as required by Condition No. 117 and 124 of the Grant;

A summary of the measures taken by the Permittee to maintain roads and to develop transportation improvements in the surrounding areas of the Facility, as required by Condition No. 77 and 119 of the Grant;

11. A summary of the measures taken by the Permittee to minimize truck traffic at the Facility as required by Condition Nos. 44, 73-79 of the Grant;

- 12. A summary of the measures taken by the Permittee to control and mitigate odor nuisance generated by the Facility, including measures taken to mitigate odor generated from incoming waste hauling trucks/customers, working face areas, and landfill gas;
- 13. A summary of the measures taken by the Permittee to ensure effectiveness and adequacy of its landfill gas collection and management system, and to utilize Landfill gas to generate energy at the Facility as required by Condition No. 62 of the Grant; and
- 14. A summary table of compliance status showing the status of compliance of each condition of approval, this IMP and MMRP. The table shall be in a format specified by the Director of Public Works in consultation with the TAC.
- C. Nothing in this Part XII shall be construed in any way to limit the authority of a Hearing Officer, the Commission, or the Board to initiate any proceeding to revoke or modify the Grant as provided in Condition No. 18 of the Grant or under Part 13, Chapter 56, of the County Zoning Ordinance.

<u>PART XIII — COMPENSATION.</u> The Permittee shall compensate all involved County departments for the expenses incurred in the administration of the Grant, including the administration of this IMP and the MMRP in the project's supporting environmental documentation, not otherwise covered by the fees paid for administration of the SWFP for the Facility. Such compensation shall be computed using the actual hours expended multiplied by the most current applicable hourly rates available at the time that the expenses are incurred, as approved by the County Auditor-Controller, including costs of personnel, equipment, and transportation costs.

<u>PART XIV — TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ("TAC").</u> A committee of County departments, chaired by the Director of the Department of Regional Planning or his/her designee, shall be established for the purpose of reviewing, coordinating, and certifying the satisfactory implementation and/or completion of the plans, permits, and/or agreements required and/or authorized by the Grant, including the implementation and/or completion of the Conditions of Approval, this IMP, and the MMRP.

- A. <u>Composition.</u> The TAC shall be composed of representative(s) of the following County departments, and other County departments on an asneeded basis as determined by the Director of Regional Planning:
  - 1. Department of Public Health;
  - 2. Department of Regional Planning;
  - 3. Department of Public Works; and

- 4. The Forester and Fire Warden.
- B. <u>Meeting/Purposes.</u> The TAC shall meet at least twice a year to ensure the purposes of the conditions of the Grant are satisfied and to ensure compliance with the approvals and regulations of State and Federal agencies that regulate and permit the Facility. One of TAC's annual meetings shall be conducted to review the annual report submitted by the Permittee as required by Part XII of this IMP and to certify that all requirements of the conditions of the Grant have been met as reflected in the annual report. The TAC shall review specific requests from the CAC regarding compliance with the Grant.

In addition to any other TAC requirement of this Part XIV, the TAC shall determine compliance with the Grant: 1) within six months after the Effective Date; 2) prior to the Permittee's development of the Household Hazardous Waste Collection Facility, Conversion Technology, and Composting Facility Project (excluding final approval of plans, permits and agreements); and/or 3) prior to the Permittee's commencement of the Closure process. The TAC shall meet for this purpose and if all of the conditions and requirements of the Grant have been met for purposes of commencing any of these phases of the project, the TAC shall certify compliance.

- C. <u>Access to the Facility and Information.</u> The Permittee shall provide access to the TAC and its independent consultant(s) to all areas of the Facility during normal hours of operation and shall respond to all information requests from the TAC and its independent Consultant(s) in a timely manner as specified by the TAC regarding compliance with the conditions of the Grant and the MMRP.
- D. The Permittee may appeal an adverse determination of the TAC to the Director of the Department of Regional Planning, whose decision shall be final.
- E. Upon the effective date of the Grant, the Director of the Department of Regional Planning or the Director of Public Works, in consultation with the TAC shall retain the services of an independent engineering consultant to monitor any and/or all of the Conditions of approval and mitigation measures throughout the life of the Grant. The Permittee shall pay all costs for the independent consultant within 30 days of receiving the invoice for the consultant's services.

The independent consultant shall perform inspections of all activities at the Facility in accordance with the conditions of approval, at least once a month, and at other frequency deemed necessary by the Director of Public Works to perform monitoring, evaluation, and other tasks necessary to implement the requirements of the conditions of approval of the Grant. The independent consultant shall prepare and submit its quarterly report to the

Director of Public Works with copies to the TAC, the CAC and other interested community representatives or groups. The Director of Public Works shall review the report and make recommendations to the Department for necessary enforcement actions in accordance with Condition No. 18 of the Grant.

#### Part XV – PERIODIC REVIEW.

In accordance with Condition No. 35 of the Conditional Use Permit, a Α. Periodic Review shall be initiated before the 10th anniversary of the effective date of the Grant and again before the 20th anniversary of the effective date of this grant. The purpose of the Periodic Reviews is to consider new or changed circumstances, such as physical development near the Project Site, improved technological innovations in environmental protection and control systems, and other best management practices that might significantly improve the operations of the Facility, and to determine if any changes to the facility operations and IMP are warranted based on the changed circumstances. To initiate the Periodic Review, the Permittee shall submit for review a permit requirement compliance study which details the status of the Permittee's compliance with the conditions of approval of this grant. Additionally, an updated Closure Plan and Post-Closure Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to the Department and the TAC for review at this time, as well as the comprehensive waste disposal study referred to in Condition No. 103 of the Conditional Use Permit, and any other information that is deemed necessary by the Department to ensure that the landfill operations are operating as efficiently and effectively as possible and that any potential adverse impacts are minimized, and that the Facility is not causing adverse impacts or nuisance in the surrounding communities.

The cost of the Periodic Reviews shall be borne by the Permittee and is to be paid through the draw-down account referred to in Condition No. 123a. For each Periodic Review, a report based on the latest information shall be made to the Hearing Officer by Department staff at a public hearing pursuant to Part 4 of Chapter 22.60 of the County Code. Each report shall include a review of the performance of the landfill and recommendations for any actions to be taken if found necessary. Such actions may include changes or modifications to the IMP, including any measures necessary to ensure that the landfill will continue to operate in a safe and effective manner and the landfill closure will be accomplished timely and effectively. The decision of the Hearing Officer on the Periodic Review may be appealed to the Regional Planning Commission. The decision of the Regional Planning Commission shall be final.

<u>Part XVI – LITTER CONTORL AND RECOVERY</u>. This Part XVI is intended to enhance the Condition No. 81 of this Grant which required the Permittee to adopt a program that uses the most effective methods and technology to prevent waste that has entered an area under the Permittee's control from escaping the area in the form of litter. In addition

to the following requirements, the program shall also include the requirements as specified under Condition No. 81, unless the DPH requires otherwise:

- a. At every active Working Face area, the Permittee shall install a primary portable litter fence of adequate height to control litter, and also a secondary fence 4 feet in height behind the primary fence when wind conditions dictate the need for a secondary fence. The Permittee shall employ Best Management Practices to control litter. On windy days, and when the fences are not sufficient, the Working Face shall be located within areas of minimal wind exposure or shall be closed, if so required by the DPH. The DPH, in coordination with the Department of Public Works, may require additional measures deemed necessary to effectively control litter, including, but not limited, requiring the Permittee to cease accepting all incoming waste during high wind conditions; and
- b. The landfill operator shall install and maintain temporary litter fences in those areas along the property perimeter that are regularly littered due to the location of the operating area, time of year, and climatic conditions. The landfill operator, the DPH and the CAC shall work together to identify littered areas in need of fencing.

| Summary of Fee Structure For Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion Project |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| CUP Condition<br>No./IMP No.  | Fee / Fund Type  | Fees  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17  | Mitigation and Monitoring Fund                               | \$10,000 (initial deposit, refillable if balance is below 80%)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 112   | Net Tipping Fee  | See Note 1  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 113   | Waste Diversion Program Fund                                 | \$0.25+CPI/ton  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 114   | Disaster Debris Planning Fund                                | \$0.10+CPI/ton  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 115   | Out-of-Area Fee  | Variable Out-of -Santa Clarita Valley Fee<br>(\$2.00-\$8.00/ton) and Out-of-County Fee<br>(\$10.00/ton) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 117   | Countywide Siting Element/Alternative Technology Development | \$200,000/yr<br>Not to exceed \$3 million total   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 118   | Natural Habitat and Park Development Fund                    | \$0.50+CPI/ton  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 119   | Traffic Mitigation & EnhancementFee                          | \$0.50+CPI/ton  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 120   | Planning Studies Fee   | \$50,000 every other year   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 121   | Community Benefit & Environmental & Educational Fund         | \$1.00+CPI/ton  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 122   | HHW/E-Waste Collection Fund                                  | \$100,000+CPI/event<br>10 events per year   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 102   | Pauting Manitaring and Increasion Funds                      | \$20,000 initial deposit for inspection (refillable if balance is below 80%)                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| 123   |  | \$50,000 initial deposit for incidental expenses<br>(refillable if balance is below 80%)                |  |  |  |  |  |
| IMP Part XI   | Community Advisory Committee (CAC)                           | \$20,000/yr   |  |  |  |  |  |

| Tonnage Breakdown         |  |  |                               |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Description               | Daily Average<br>Capacity<br>(ton/day-6) | Daily Maximum<br>Tonnage<br>(tons/day) | Monthly<br>Maximum<br>Tonnage | Yearly<br>Maximum<br>Tonnage |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solid Waste               | 5,000                                    | any combination                        | 116,667                       | 1,400,000                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beneficial Use/Composting | 1,730                                    | any combination                        | 58,333                        | 700,000                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total                     | 6,730                                    | 12,000                                 | 175,000                       | 2,100,000                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Daily Average Capacity is based on the Yearly Maximum Tonnage and 312 days of operations.

|                            | Chiquita Canyon Landfill IMP/CUP Monitoring Reports Due Dates   |                                  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Item Number                | Typeof Review/Report  | Responsible Monitoring<br>Agency | Frequency  | Purpose   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IMP PART I-A               | Annual Monitoring Report  | DPW                              | Once a Year (prior to use of<br>the CUP and annually<br>thereafter, March 1st) | Survey Monuments  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IMP PART XII-A             | MP PART XII-A       Annual Monitoring Report Draft       DRP         MP PART XII-A       Annual Monitoring Report       DRP         CUP-16       Annual Mitigation Monitoring       DRP |                                  | Once a Year (90 days prior to<br>March 1st)                                    | To enhance the continuing oversight of Landfill operations  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IMP PART XII-A             |   |                                  | Once a Year (due March 1st)  | To Provide oversight of Landfill operations, activities, and maintenance of the facility  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUP-16                     |   |                                  | Once a Year (Due July 1st)   | To depict the status of the Permittee's compliance with the required measures   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUP-35 Periodic Review DRP |   | DRP                              | On the 10th and 20th<br>anniversary of the effective<br>date of the new CUP    | To allow the Hearing Officer and/or the Regional Planning<br>Commission and TAC to review the studies submitted by the<br>Permittee and issue a Finding of Fact and potentially approve<br>changes to the IMP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES Public Health

> CYNTHIA A. HARDING, M.P.H. Interim Director

JEFFREY D. GUNZENHAUSER, M.D., M.P.H. Interim Health Officer

ANGELO J. BELLOMO, REHS, QEP Deputy Director for Health Protection

TERRI S. WILLIAMS, REHS Director of Environmental Health

BRENDA J. LOPEZ, REHS Assistant Director of Environmental Health

5050 Commerce Drive Baldwin Park, California 91706

January 9, 2017

Richard Claghorn LA County Department of Regional Planning Via email: <u>rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov</u>

#### SUBJECT: PARTIALLY RECIRCULATED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL (SCH 2005081071)

Dear Mr. Claghorn:

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Solid Waste Management Program, acting as Local Enforcement Agency (LEA), appreciates the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Chiquita Canyon Landfill – Master Plan Revision – Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (PR-DEIR).

#### Scope of the PR-DEIR

A Draft Environmental Impact Report for Chiquita Canyon Landfill was released for public review and circulated in 2014. With the release of this PR-DEIR (dated November 9, 2016), the lead agency is requesting that reviewers limit comments to the content of the revised/recirculated portions only.

The PR-DEIR includes the following revised/recirculated chapters/sections:

**ES** – Executive Summary

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Project Description
- 8 Biological Resources
- 11 Air Quality

12 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

18 - Project Alternatives

Supplements – Visual Resources, Traffic Supplement Appendixes – (E) Biological Resources, (H) Air Quality



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis First District

Mark Ridley-Thomas Second District

Sheila Kuehl Third District Ianice Hahn

Fourth District

Kathryn Barger Fifth District

#### Tables & Figures in chapters/sections ES, 1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 18

#### **Proposed Project Description**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) is proposing the following:

- 1. To develop a new landfill entrance and relocate existing support facilities.
- 2. To provide a lateral and vertical expansion of the landfill's disposal area. This involves increasing the waste (disposal) footprint by 143 acres (from 257 to 400 acres) within the existing site boundary (specified as 639 acres), and increasing the maximum elevation from 1430 feet mean sea level (MSL) to 1573 feet MSL. This increase would modify the final landfill topography. *See comments, below.*
- 3. To increase allowable tonnage from 6000 tons per day (TPD) to 12,000 TPD, and from 30,000 tons per week (TPW) to 60,000 TPW. *See comments, below*.
- 4. To operate a mixed organics processing/composting operation on-site with an allowable tonnage of 560 TPD. The proposed new operation would add pre- and post-consumer food waste as a feedstock. (The site has pre-existing approval to operate a green waste composting operation on-site, but is not currently operating the facility.) See comment, below.
- 5. To allow the receipt and disposal of all non-hazardous solid wastes acceptable at a Class III solid waste landfill, exclusive of sludge.
- 6. To allow continued acceptance of beneficial reuse material. See comments, below.
- 7. To expand on-site environmental control systems as needed to accommodate additional disposal tonnages and volume.
- 8. To develop a household hazardous waste facility (HHWF).
- 9. To set aside land for a future waste conversion technology facility.

#### **General Comments**

GC-1 – Total Throughput Tonnage for the Proposed Project (PP), and Peak Maximum Tonnages for Disposal, Beneficial Reuse, Mixed Organics Processing/Composting, and Soil/Contaminated Soil.

A revision to the Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) issued by the LEA and concurred with by California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) must be obtained for the proposed project.

Any Revised Solid Waste Facility Permit (R-SWFP) issued for the proposed project will specify a (cumulative) *total throughput tonnage* for the entire site inclusive of the following:

- All in-bound tonnages for the mixed organics processing/composting facility.
- All in-bound tonnages for the landfill inclusive of all solid waste materials for disposal, solid waste materials for beneficial reuse, and both clean and/or contaminated soil imported for onsite use.

In addition, peak maximum tonnages for each of the aforementioned material categories will be specified on the R-SWFP. As such, PR-DEIR should clearly delineate the maximum tonnages analyzed for each.

The proposed analyzed tonnage maximum for all inbound materials need to be clarified throughout the PR-DEIR.

#### GC-2 – Proposed Peak Maximum Tonnage for Beneficial Reuse.

As stated above in comment GC-1, the R-SWFP will specify a peak maximum tonnage of solid waste for beneficial reuse. As currently written in the PR-DEIR, depending on interpretation, proposed analyzed tonnage maximum for beneficial reuse material to be received (total) could be limited to either 2358 TPD, 622 TPD, or another unspecified amount.

Table 1-2 shows the proposed project (PP) tonnage of 13,182 TPD for all inbound material. The footnote states that the PP is the sum of the operational baseline 6,622 TPD – which according to Table 1-1 is comprised of waste disposed (4,264 TPD) and beneficial reuse material (2,358 TPD) – with the addition of 6,000 TPD of *waste to be disposed* and 560 TPD of mixed organics material. However, the column on the far left-hand side is entitled "Disposal Materials and Beneficial Reuse Materials." Should the 6,000 TPD of waste be considered as an amount for *waste to be disposed* (only), as stated in the footnote, or does it allow for both waste and beneficial reuse materials (as stated in the column title) up to 6,000 TPD? Depending on how this is interpreted, the proposed analyzed tonnage maximum for beneficial reuse material receipt could be limited to 2,358 TPD (total) or could be 2,358 TPD plus an unspecified portion of the project's additional 6,000 TPD of waste.

Table 1-4 shows in "Rate of All Inbound Material to Be Received" 6,622 TPD for the baseline and 13,182 TPD for the PP. However, it also states in "Rate of *Wastes* to Be Received" 6,000 permitted TPD for the baseline and 12,000 permitted TPD for the PP. Does the category "Rate of *Wastes* to be Received" include beneficial reuse materials to be received, or does it refer only to wastes received for disposal. Depending on how this is interpreted, the proposed analyzed tonnage maximum for beneficial reuse material receipt could be limited to 2,358 TPD or could be limited to as little as 622 TPD. (It should be noted, as well, that the summary table and "Detailed Descriptions" in Section 2.2.4.1 "Wastes to be Disposed" does again indicate that 12,000 permitted TPD under the project does not include beneficial use materials.)

Text in Section 2.2.4.3 "All Inbound Material" states that the PP will increase the rate of all inbound material over the current operational baseline, and that all inbound material consists of waste to be disposed, mixed organics composting material, and beneficial use material. However, Table 2-2 shows "Waste to be Disposed" at 6,000 TPD with "Material to be Diverted from Disposal" at 0 TPD.

GC-3 – Apparent Lack of Increased Beneficial Reuse Material

As stated above, there are discrepancies in the specified (or inferred) amount of beneficial reuse material to be received under the proposed project. However, some of the information in the PR-DEIR does seem to indicate that there is no anticipated increase in the amount of beneficial reuse material to be received for the PP. In fact, Table 18-1, which examines various totals for the PP and two alternative projects (Alt B and Alt C), shows the same beneficial reuse material rates for all projects, 14,148 tons per week (which calculates to 2,358 TPD, the same as the baseline amount shown in Table 1-1). In addition, Table 2-2 clearly shows no increase in TPD of "Material to be Diverted from Disposal." Please clarify why additional beneficial reuse materials would not be utilized for additional waste received for disposal at CCL.

#### GC-4 - Characterization of Beneficial Reuse and Diverted Materials

The PR-DEIR specifies (Section 1.7.2, and 2.2.3.3) that beneficial reuse refers to solid waste materials, contaminated soil, as well as (imported) clean soil used beneficially on-site.

Neither clean soil nor contaminated soil used "beneficially" onsite can be considered a beneficially reused solid waste material, nor considered a diverted material. Relevant regulations are summarized below:

- 27 CCR 20680 states that earthen material shall include contaminated soil.
- 27 CCR 20686 "Beneficial Reuse" discusses the use of solid waste materials for beneficial use onsite at a solid waste facility. Soil and/or contaminated soil (suitable for use onsite) is not a solid waste material.
- 14 CCR 18801.1
  - o (a) & (b) ADC & AIC do not include the use of clean or contaminated soil.
  - (c) Beneficial reuse does not include the use of clean or contaminated soil.
  - (d) Clean and contaminated soil used as cover or for other beneficial reuse do not count as disposal or diversion.

#### GC-5 – Total Site Acreage and Permitted Boundary

There is a discrepancy between total site acreage (permitted boundary) specified in the PR-DEIR (639 acres) and the current Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) (592 acres). Please explain the 47 acre discrepancy or correct, as appropriate. If it is the intention of this project to expand the permitted boundary of the landfill site, this should be clearly stated, and associated impacts analyzed.

#### **Comments – Chapter 1 – Introduction**

1.5, text and Table 1-1 and Chart 1-1: Please refer to comments GC-1 and GC-2, above.

1.6.1, Table 1-2: Please refer to comments GC-1 and GC-2, above.

#### 1.6.3, Table 1-4:

- "Type of Material to be Received":
  - The receipt of separated organics for processing/composting is proposed. *This is a change* from the receipt of (current permitted) green waste (only) materials for composting. Organic materials separated are highly putrescible and must be managed carefully to avoid odor issues.
  - See GC-4, above. Clean soil (or contaminated soil) should not be described as a beneficial reuse material.
- "Rate of All Inbound Materials to be Received": Please refer to comments GC-1, GC-2, and GC-3, above.
- "Landfill Operation": Please refer to comments GC-1, GC-2, and GC-3, above.

1.7.2, text, table and chart:

- The Local Enforcement Agency is Los Angeles County Department of *Public* Health, Solid Waste Management Program.
- See GC-1, GC-2, GC-4, above. Clean and/or contaminated soil imported for onsite "beneficial" use should not be characterized (or counted) as beneficial reuse of solid waste materials, nor as diversion.
- The Chiquita Canyon Landfill Joint Technical Document (1998, revised 9/2003), the currently approved operating document for the site, describes the use of treated autoshredder waste (TASW) and processed green material for Alternative Daily Cover (ADC). Other materials listed in Section 1.7.2 (and elsewhere in the PR-DEIR) have not been specified in the Joint Technical Document (JTD) for ADC or beneficial reuse, nor are they currently approved for use at CCL.

1.7.3, text, table, and chart: See GC-1, GC-2, and GC-3, above.

1.9.3: The Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Solid Waste Management Program acting as the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) issues the Solid Waste Facilities Permit with concurrence from CalRecycle.

#### **Comments – Chapter 2 – Project Description**

2.2.3.3, entire section:

- See GC-1, GC-2, GC-4, above.
- The Chiquita Canyon Landfill Joint Technical Document (1998, revised 9/2003), the currently approved operating document for the site, describes and specifies beneficial

reuse of solid waste materials. Only those materials specified in the JTD are currently approved for use at CCL.

- Table 2-1, under the category "Clean Soil" it states that "...there are no restrictions on the use of clean soil at CCL." The R-SWFP will specify a daily maximum inbound tonnage amount for clean and/or contaminated soil imported for onsite use. See comment GC-1, above.
- Table 2-1, Footnote 3: It is stated here that clean soil is not required to be regulated as a waste by the RWQCB or "Local Oversight Agency." Please define the term Local Oversight Agency. The R-SWFP will specify a daily maximum inbound tonnage amount for clean and/or contaminated soil imported for onsite use. See comment GC-1, above.

#### 2.2.4.1, entire section:

- See comments GC-1, GC-2 and GC-3.
- An estimated closure date and total design capacity of the landfill will be required for the issuance of a R-SWFP.

2.2.4.3, entire section: See comments GC-1, GC-2, and GC-3 re tonnages, above.

2.2.6: Site operations under the proposed project will include the receipt and use of beneficial reuse material and the importation and use of clean/contaminated soil, and as such, should be included.

2.2.6.4: A R-SWFP issued for the proposed project will include provisions for a required loadcheck ratio of one load check for every 500 tons of solid waste material, or portion thereof, received at the facility during each operating day.

2.2.6.6: Will the receipt of mixed organics materials for the composting facility be limited to the same hours and days as waste receipt for (landfill) disposal? Waste receipt is limited under the current SWFP to 24 hours per day except Sunday 5 p.m. through 4 a.m. Monday.

2.2.6.9:

- RE imported soil: see comment GC-1, above.
- RE ADC materials: The Chiquita Canyon Landfill Joint Technical Document (1998, revised 9/2003), the currently approved operating document for the site, describes the use of treated auto-shredder waste (TASW) and processed green material for Alternative Daily Cover (ADC). Other materials listed have not been specified in the Joint Technical Document (JTD) for ADC, nor are they currently approved for use at CCL.

**Comments – Chapter 18 – Project Alternatives** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill Partially Recirculated DEIR LEA's Comments – January 9, 2017

18.8, Table 18-1:

- RE Beneficial Reuse:
  - Beneficial reuse material type: See GC-4, above.
- Beneficial reuse material rate: See comment GC-3, above.
- Total Volume: Please define this category.
- Total Tonnage: Please define this category.

#### Conclusion

The LEA requests copies of any subsequent and/or related environmental documents, Notices of Determination, etc., for the proposed project. In addition, the LEA requests notification of any public hearings relative to the project at least ten days in advance. Documents/notices may be mailed to the Solid Waste Management Program address shown below, or emailed to Ms. Dorcas Hanson-Lugo, Supervisor, LEA Permitting Unit at dlugo@ph.lacounty.gov.

Again, the LEA thanks you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Should you have any questions regarding the comments or information contained in this letter, please feel free to contact me via email at **jbiehler@ph.lacounty.gov** or by telephone at (626) 430-5540.

Sincerely

Jeanne Biehler, R.E.H.S. Bureau of Environmental Protection Solid Waste Management Program, Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) 5050 Commerce Drive Baldwin Park, CA 91706 (626) 430-5540

c:

Jeff Hackett and Virginia Rosales, CalRecycle Nelly Castellanos, LEA Dorcas Hanson-Lugo, LEA

# Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

### Introduction

The *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA) requires a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of project approval and development. The Original Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) and Partially Recirculated Draft EIR prepared for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) Master Plan Revision identified mitigation measures, where appropriate, to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project. This MMRP is designed to monitor the implementation of those mitigation measures. Accordingly, this MMRP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6 and *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15097.

The MMRP that follows lists each of the proposed mitigation measures and identifies the corresponding action required to document compliance, the mitigation timing, the party responsible for implementation, and the monitoring agency or party responsible for overseeing that each measure is adequately implemented.

In addition to the mitigation measures proposed to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project, this MMRP also includes construction and operation emission reduction practices and measures used in the analysis of potential air quality impacts. These emission reduction practices and measures are treated the same as Proposed Project mitigation measures.

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   |   | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing  | Responsible<br>Party        | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party   |
|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------|---|
| Geology and Hydrology   |   |  |   |                             |   |
| GH-1 Debris Flow: Debris flow is a rapid and fluid type of<br>downhill mass wasting, consisting of heterogeneous debris<br>lubricated with water caused by heavy rainfall. Similar terms for<br>debris flow are mudflow and mudslide. There is a potential for<br>debris flow occurring at the site during heavy rains within<br>existing drainage areas at the subject site. The proposed design<br>shall include provisions for control and cleanup of debris flows<br>that may encroach into the landfill cell, perimeter maintenance<br>road, and proposed development areas. Potential mitigation<br>measures could consist of combinations of the following<br> | Α.  | Retain a qualified engineer to<br>evaluate the site's potential for<br>debris flow, identify areas of<br>concern and recommend design<br>provisions for control and cleanup<br>of debris flows should such design<br>provisions be justified based on<br>the evaluation. | During Project<br>design  | CCL / Qualified<br>Engineer | Los Angeles County<br>Department of<br>Public Works<br>(LACDPW),<br>Regional Water<br>Quality Control<br>Boards (RWQCB) |
|   | В.  | Incorporate provisions, as<br>recommended by a qualified<br>engineer, into the design for<br>control and cleanup of debris<br>flows that may encroach into the<br>landfill cell, perimeter<br>maintenance road, and proposed<br>development areas.                       | During Project<br>design  | CCL / Qualified<br>Engineer | LACDPW, RWQCB   |
|   | C.  | Perform additional debris flow<br>evaluation and mitigation as part<br>of future development of rough<br>grading plans for the entrance<br>road.   | During future<br>development of<br>rough grading plans<br>for entrance road | CCL /Qualified<br>Engineer  | LACDPW, RWQCB   |
| GH-2 Expansive Soil: There is a potential for buildings and/or<br>other structures to be located on expansive soil, because the<br>site is underlain by bedrock of the Pico and Saugus formations,<br>both of which contain potentially expansive clay-rich strata.<br>Additional testing of the expansive properties of the soils may<br>be required if buildings and/or other structures sensitive to<br>expansive soils are planned for the site. Additional testing<br>should be completed during the grading plan review if deemed<br>necessary by the Project geotechnical and civil engineers.A.   | Α.  | Retain a qualified engineer to<br>perform design-level geotechnical<br>investigations to identify areas<br>with potentially expansive or<br>collapsible soils in relation to<br>buildings and/or other structures.   | During Project<br>design  | CCL / Qualified<br>Engineer | LACDPW  |
|   | Perform additional testing if<br>deemed necessary by the Project<br>geotechnical and civil engineers. | During grading plan review   | CCL / Qualified<br>Engineer   | LACDPW                      |   |

| Table 1. Chiquita Can | von Landfill Master Plan Revision N | <b>Mitigation Monitoring</b> | g and Reporting Program |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
|                       |                                     |                              |                         |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   |    | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing                 | Responsible<br>Party                                       | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party                             |
|---|----|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Surface Water Drainage  | •  |  |                                      | ·  |   |
| <b>SW-1:</b> There is a potential for mudflow (i.e., debris flow) during repeated heavy rains within existing drainage areas at the subject site. The proposed design should evaluate and specify an appropriate amount of waiting time following heavy and sustained precipitation events before CCL staff occupy the area, to avoid the potential to expose people to the risk of injury or death from this debris. This would supplement Mitigation Measure GH-1, which specifies that the proposed design should allow for the cleanup or control of any debris flows that may encroach into the landfill cell and perimeter maintenance road from the natural drainages and slopes that are not included in the proposed grading and construction of drainage/debris basins.   | Α. | Retain a qualified engineer to<br>evaluate and specify an<br>appropriate amount of waiting<br>time following heavy and<br>sustained precipitation events<br>before CCL staff occupy the area.                    | During Project<br>design             | CCL / Qualified<br>Engineer                                | LACDPW, RWQCB   |
|   | В. | Implement specified wait time<br>following heavy and sustained<br>precipitation events prior to CCL<br>staff occupying the area.   | During construction<br>and operation | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Operations<br>Manager   | LACDPW, RWQCB   |
| Biological Resources  | •  |  |                                      |  |   |
| <ul> <li>BR-1: The applicant shall develop a Closure Revegetation Plan<br/>for the Project in consultation with the Los Angeles County<br/>Department of Regional Planning (LADRP), consistent with the<br/>Draft Revegetation, Rare Plant Relocation, and Oak Tree<br/>Performance Criteria provided in Appendix E3 of the Partially<br/>Recirculated Draft EIR. The Plan would require approval prior to<br/>authorization of land disturbance under the Proposed Project.<br/>The Plan shall require that CCL be revegetated to offset<br/>permanent impacts to native and naturalized habitats, in<br/>accordance with the following criteria:</li> <li>Native vegetation shall be used under the direction of<br/>specialists in restoration plantings. Native revegetated,<br/>and semi-natural habitat to revegetated mitigation land.<br/>Non-native grassland habitats would be initially seeded<br/>with native grassland species.</li> </ul> | Α. | Develop Closure Revegetation Plan<br>consistent with Draft<br>Revegetation, Rare Plant<br>Relocation, and Oak Tree<br>Performance Criteria provided in<br>Appendix E of the Partially<br>Recirculated Draft EIR. | Prior to earth-<br>moving activities | CCL / Qualified<br>Ecological<br>Restoration<br>Specialist | LADRP, Permittee's<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist |

|   | Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  |    | Action Required   | Mitigation<br>Timing   | Responsible<br>Party   | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party                                |  |
|---|--|----|---|--|--|--|--|
| • | Revegetation types, monitoring requirements, and success<br>criteria including milestones, along with proposed remedial<br>actions should vegetation alliances not achieve success<br>criteria shall be included in the Closure Revegetation Plan,<br>in accordance with the preliminary approach outlined in<br>the Draft Revegetation, Rare Plant Relocation, and Oak<br>Tree Performance Criteria provided in Appendix E3 of the<br>Partially Recirculated Draft EIR.   | В. | Implement Closure Revegetation<br>Plan, per specified criteria. | Site closure, or at<br>the time of<br>revegetation   | CCL / Qualified<br>Ecological<br>Restoration<br>Specialist   | LADRP,<br>Permittee's<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist |  |
| • | In order to replicate and potentially expand the available<br>amount of native shrubland on the site, the Closure<br>Revegetation Plan shall include a final soil cover of<br>approximately 5 feet, or alternatively a depth approved by<br>regulatory agencies and suitable to allow for proper root<br>growth.   |    |   |  |  |  |  |
| • | The Closure Revegetation Plan shall be developed and<br>implemented by an ecological restoration specialist familiar<br>with restoration of native and naturalized Southern<br>California plant alliances, and shall specify that<br>revegetation will be done with locally native plants, and<br>that revegetation will not include plant species on Los<br>Angeles County's list of invasive species nor invasive<br>species on the lists of the California Invasive Plant Council<br>(Cal-IPC) nor invasive species listed by the California Native | C. | C.  | Perform onsite remedial actions<br>consistent with the Closure<br>Revegetation Plan, if success<br>criteria are not met. | Following<br>revegetation,<br>according to the<br>Draft Revegetation,<br>Rare Plant<br>Relocation, and Oak | CCL / Qualified<br>Ecological<br>Restoration<br>Specialist   | LADRP,<br>Permittee's<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist |
| • | If success criteria for vegetation alliances are not met,<br>remedial actions will be performed onsite consistent with<br>the Closure Revegetation Plan.   |    |   | Tree Performance<br>Criteria included in<br>Appendix D of the<br>Partially   |  |  |  |
| • | If success criteria for native shrub or forest alliances are not<br>met even after remedial actions are performed, offsite<br>mitigation land shall be purchased to offset the loss of the<br>portion of the alliance vegetation that does not meet the<br>success criteria at a 1:1 ratio (impacted:mitigation land).<br>The acreage acquired shall, if feasible, be generally local to<br>the site or the general site area, ideally situated adjacent to  |    |   | Recirculated Draft<br>EIR  |  |  |  |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  |    | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing   | Responsible<br>Party          | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party                                |
|--|----|--|--|-------------------------------|--|
| or in the general proximity of the Santa Clara River, Hasley<br>Canyon, or Angeles National Forest, and will connect with<br>other protected open space. First priority would be given to<br>lands that contribute to connecting the wildlife movement<br>between the Santa Clara River through CCL to Hasley<br>Canyon and to the Angeles National Forest.  | D. | Purchase offsite mitigation land,<br>if success criteria are not met<br>following onsite remedial actions.   | Following<br>revegetation,<br>according to the<br>Draft Revegetation,<br>Rare Plant<br>Relocation, and Oak<br>Tree Performance | CCL                           | LADRP,<br>Permittee's<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist |
| simple deed which contains a covenant restricting the use<br>of such land for conservation purposes to a conservation<br>organization experienced in management of natural lands.  |    |  | Criteria included in<br>Appendix D of the<br>Partially   |                               |  |
| <ul> <li>Additional mitigation for vegetation communities is<br/>included in Mitigation Measure BR-5 (vegetation associated<br/>with jurisdictional waters), Mitigation Measure BR-9 (rare<br/>plant communities), and Mitigation Measure BR-15 (oaks<br/>and oak woodlands). Mitigation ratios for replacement of<br/>these vegetation communities may be greater than the<br/>1:1 ratio specified above, in coordination with California<br/>Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for jurisdictional<br/>waters and rare plant communities and in coordination<br/>with LADRP for compliance with the County Oak Woodland<br/>Conservation and Management Plan.</li> </ul> |    |  | Recirculated Draft<br>EIR  |                               |  |
| <b>BR-2:</b> The construction area boundaries shall be delineated clearly. No construction activities, vehicular access, equipment   | Α. | Clearly delineate construction area boundaries.  | Prior to and during construction   | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | LADRP  |
| storage, stockpiling, or significant human intrusion shall occur<br>outside of the designated construction areas. In addition, CCL<br>ingress and egress routes shall be marked, and vehicle traffic<br>outside these routes shall be prohibited. Vehicular traffic shall<br>adhere to a speed limit of 15 miles per hour on non-public<br>access roads during construction to ensure avoidance of impacts<br>to sensitive biological resources.   | В. | Restrict construction activities,<br>vehicular access, equipment<br>storage, stockpiling, or significant<br>human intrusion to within<br>designated construction area. | During construction  | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | LADRP  |
|  | C. | Mark CCL ingress and egress routes and restrict vehicle traffic to these routes.   | Prior to and during construction   | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | LADRP  |
|  | D. | Restrict vehicular traffic to a speed<br>limit of 15 miles per hour on non-<br>public access roads during<br>construction.   | During construction  | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | LADRP  |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  |    | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing  | Responsible<br>Party          | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party                                    |
|--|----|--|---|-------------------------------|--|
| <ul> <li>BR-3: Soil or invasive plant seed transfer from clothing, shoes, or equipment shall be minimized through cleaning and monitoring of personnel or equipment transfers between sites, or prior to initial entry at CCL. Contract requirements to ensure all construction vehicles, including any vehicles entering areas of site construction, are pressure washed and/or clean and free of soil or invasive weed seeds and other plant parts prior to entering the site will be implemented. Contracts will specify that pressure-washing of construction vehicles is to take place immediately before bringing the vehicle to CCL. The contractor will provide written documentation that the vehicles have been pressure washed or otherwise free of plant material that is checked by both CCL management and the biological monitor, who will jointly assure that this mitigation is implemented. The biological monitoring report will include a record of compliance with this measure.</li> <li>Within 1 year of Project approval invasive tamarisk (<i>Tamarix</i> spp.) located onsite will be identified and removed completely. All parts of removed tamarisk will be disposed of in a landfill.</li> </ul> | Α. | Specify in contracts that<br>construction vehicles are pressure<br>washed and/or clean and free of<br>soil or invasive weed seeds and<br>other plant parts prior to site<br>entry.   | During construction   | CCL                           | LADRP  |
|  | В. | Provide written documentation<br>that construction vehicles have<br>been pressure washed or<br>otherwise free of plant material.   | During construction   | Construction<br>Contractor    | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Biological Monitor,<br>LADRP  |
|  | C. | Identify, remove, and dispose of<br>invasive tamarisk located onsite<br>within 1 year of Project approval.<br>Immediately report any tamarisk<br>that may appear in the future on<br>the site to LADRP biologist if<br>detected and remove from the<br>site. | Within 1 year of<br>Project approval<br>and ongoing before<br>and after<br>construction | CCL                           | LADRP, Permittee's<br>Registered Biologist                       |
| <b>BR-4:</b> On-road vehicles on the construction sites will be equipped with spark arresters on exhaust equipment. Camp fires, trash-burning fires, and warming fires shall be prohibited in the construction area.   | A. | Require on-road vehicles on<br>construction sites to be equipped<br>with spark arresters on exhaust<br>equipment.  | Prior to and during construction  | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | LADRP, Fire<br>Marshall  |
|  | В. | Prohibit camp fires, trash-burning fires, and warming fires in the construction area.  | During construction   | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | LADRP, Fire<br>Marshall  |
| <b>BR-5:</b> For potential impacts to jurisdictional waters, permits shall be obtained for the Proposed Project from United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE; Section 404, Clean Water Act [CWA]) and CDFW (Streambed Alteration Agreement, Section 1603); conditions of these permits would be complied with for the Proposed Project. The terms and conditions of these permits are anticipated to require mitigation consistent with <i>Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources; Final</i>   | Α. | As applicable, obtain permits from<br>USACE and CDFW for potential<br>impacts to jurisdictional waters.  | Prior to impacting jurisdictional waters  | CCL                           | USACE and/or CA<br>Dept. of Fish &<br>Wildlife (CDFW),<br>LACDPW |
|  | В. | Implement mitigation consistent with terms and conditions of permits.  | During construction<br>and post<br>construction   | CCL                           | USACE and/or<br>CDFW, LACDPW                                     |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  |    | Action Required   | Mitigation<br>Timing                     | Responsible<br>Party          | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party          |
|--|----|---|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Rule (USACE, United States Environmental Protection Agency<br>[EPA], Federal Register, April 10, 2008), and with CDFW<br>requirements for Streambed Alteration Agreements.<br>A mitigation plan may be required prior to permit issuance. If a<br>mitigation plan is required, ratios of waters impacted to waters<br>mitigated would be negotiated with the regulatory agencies and<br>the results of that negotiation included in the plan.  | C. | Prepare mitigation plan, if required.   | Prior to permit<br>issuance, if required | CCL                           | USACE and/or<br>CDFW, LACDPW           |
| <b>BR-6:</b> Stationary equipment such as motors, pumps, generators, and welders shall be located a minimum of 50 feet outside CDFW and USACE jurisdictional drainages where impacts have not been permitted. Construction staging areas, stockpiling, and aggingment storage shall be located a minimum of 50 feet  | Α. | Locate stationary equipment a<br>minimum of 50 feet outside non-<br>permitted CDFW and USACE<br>jurisdictional drainages.   | During construction                      | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | CDFW and/or<br>USACE, LACDPW           |
| equipment storage shall be located a minimum of 50 feet<br>outside non-permitted CDFW and USACE jurisdictional<br>drainages. Construction vehicles and equipment shall be<br>checked periodically to ensure they are in proper working<br>condition, including regular inspections for leaks, which would<br>require immediate repair. Refueling or lubrication of vehicles<br>and cleaning of equipment, or other activities that involve open<br>use of fuels, lubricants, or solvents, shall occur at least 100 feet<br>away from CDFW and USACE jurisdictional drainages where<br>impacts have not been permitted, and at least 50 feet from<br>other flagged, sensitive biological resources. | В. | Locate construction staging areas,<br>stockpiling, and equipment<br>storage a minimum of 50 feet<br>outside non-permitted CDFW and<br>USACE jurisdictional drainages.   | During construction                      | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | CDFW and/or<br>USACE, LACDPW           |
|  | C. | Check construction vehicles and<br>equipment periodically to ensure<br>they are in proper working<br>condition.   | During construction                      | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | CDFW and/or<br>USACE, LADRP,<br>LACDPW |
|  | D. | Locate refueling or lubrication of<br>vehicles and cleaning of<br>equipment, or other activities that<br>involve use of fuels, lubricants, or<br>solvents, a minimum of 100 feet<br>outside non-permitted CDFW and<br>USACE jurisdictional drainages and<br>at least 50 feet from other flagged,<br>sensitive biological resources. | During construction                      | CCL / Construction<br>Manager | CDFW and/or<br>USACE, LADRP,<br>LACDPW |
| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  |    | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing                 | Responsible<br>Party                                     | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party               |
|--|----|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>BR-7:</b> Only pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, dust suppressants, or other potentially harmful materials approved by EPA and/or the California Department of Toxic Substance Control shall be applied at CCL, in accordance with relevant state and federal regulations. Rodenticides will not be used. Instead, methods that do not persist and infiltrate the natural food chain will be used for pest elimination, such as trapping, gassing, etc. Sediment basins are present along all drainages at CCL, which capture runoff prior to discharging offsite. Sediment basins will continue to be regularly maintained.   | Α. | Apply only pesticides, herbicides,<br>fertilizers, dust suppressants, or<br>other potentially harmful<br>materials approved by the EPA<br>and/or the California Department<br>of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC),<br>in accordance with state and<br>federal regulations. | During construction<br>and operation | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Operations<br>Manager | LADRP, RWQCB                                |
|  | В. | Prohibit use of rodenticides.<br>Instead, use trapping, gassing, or<br>other methods that do not persist<br>and infiltrate the natural food<br>chain.  | During construction<br>and operation | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Operations<br>Manager | LADRP, RWQCB                                |
|  | C. | Maintain sediment basins<br>regularly.   | During operation                     | CCL / Operations<br>Manager                              | LADRP, RWQCB,<br>LACDPW                     |
| <b>BR-8:</b> Construction sites and landfill operation shall be kept free<br>of trash and litter. Food-related trash and litter shall be placed<br>in closed containers and disposed of daily. Nuisance wildlife<br>breeding will be discouraged at CCL by excluding such species<br>from cavities in buildings and/or equipment or facilities to be<br>left idle for more than 6 months. To reduce risk of infestation by<br>the non-native Argentine ant ( <i>Linepithema humile</i> ), a 500-foot<br>buffer will be established adjacent to natural habitats at CCL<br>within which no permanent, artificial water sources will be<br>applied, and inspections for exotic ant infestations will be<br>required for any landscape or restoration container-stock plants<br>proposed for installation. Landfill operations require daily<br>covering of all portions of the active landfill; this practice would<br>be continued, further reducing risk of nuisance wildlife. | А. | Keep construction sites and landfill operation free of food-related trash and litter.  | During construction<br>and operation | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Operations<br>Manager | LADRP, Local<br>Enforcement<br>Agency (LEA) |
|  | В. | Place food related trash and litter<br>in closed containers and dispose<br>daily.  | During construction<br>and operation | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Operations<br>Manager | LADRP, LEA                                  |
|  | C. | Install exclusionary devices on<br>cavities in buildings and/or<br>equipment or facilities to be left<br>idle for more than 6 months.  | During construction<br>and operation | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Operations<br>Manager | LADRP, LEA                                  |
|  | D. | Establish 500-foot buffer and manage risk of Argentine ant infestation, per measure.   | During construction<br>and operation | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Operations<br>Manager | LADRP, LEA                                  |
|  | E. | Provide daily covering of all portions of active working face of the landfill.   | During operation                     | CCL / Operations<br>Manager                              | LEA, LACDPW                                 |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   |    | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing   | Responsible<br>Party        | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party  |
|---|----|--|--|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>BR-9:</b> Preconstruction surveys by qualified botanists shall be conducted for special-status plant species in impact areas prior to ground-disturbing activities, and if necessary and feasible, resource relocation or avoidance shall be implemented.  | Α. | Conduct preconstruction special-<br>status plant surveys.  | Prior to ground-<br>disturbing activities                                  | CCL / Qualified<br>Botanist | CDFW, Permittee' s<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist,<br>LACDRP |
| <ul> <li>Resource relocation of avoidance shall be implemented.</li> <li>Resource relocation will be to a location deemed suitable for successful relocation by a qualified biologist and conducted in coordination with CDFW. Avoidance zones shall be established with fencing and/or signage that restricts access.</li> <li>For rare plants, this shall include focused surveys by a qualified botanist conducted during the appropriate season for detection (generally during flowering period) prior to ground-disturbing activities over the entire disturbance area proposed for the Project, and then again the first season prior to disturbance over the area proposed to be disturbed for each phase (cell) of landfill development. If suitable transplant areas for rare plants exist at CCL, surveys will also include potential areas for relocation onsite in order to provide background data for determining transplant success. If no suitable relocation areas exist at CCL, potential mitigation areas in conserved areas within the local watersheds will be identified and surveyed at the same time in order to have background data. Surveys shall follow standard survey protocol for rare plants outlined in <i>Guidelines for Federally Listed, Proposed and Candidate Plants</i> (United States Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS], 1996) and/or <i>Protocols for Surveying and Evaluation Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities</i> (CDFW, 2009).</li> <li>If special-status plants are found at CCL they shall be field marked and mapped with global positioning system units to evaluate potential for impacts from proposed grading. Where feasible, special-status plants will be avoided; protective measures to avoid adverse impacts to the area shall be implemented. Protected zones adjacent to active construction or active landfill will be demarcated with permanent fencing. More remote protected zones not</li> </ul> | B. | Implement resource relocation or<br>avoidance (if necessary and<br>feasible) as specified in Mitigation<br>Measure BR-9, including focused<br>surveys, Avoidance zones,<br>implementation of a Rare Plant<br>Relocation Plan, and performance<br>monitoring. | Prior to<br>construction, during<br>construction, and<br>post construction | CCL / Qualified<br>Botanist | CDFW, Permittee' s<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist,<br>LACDRP |
| accessible by construction equipment or near adjacent   |    |  |  |                             |  |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  | Action Required | Mitigation<br>Timing | Responsible<br>Party | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| road access points shall be demarcated by temporary<br>fencing (e.g., orange construction fencing) when road<br>access is within 100 feet. If road access becomes<br>immediately available to the area, permanent fencing will<br>be installed. Fencing shall be maintained and construction<br>crews informed about avoidance during construction. The<br>site biological monitor will continue to monitor compliance<br>with protected zones.  |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>Rare plants have been identified within construction limits during 2016 surveys. For these, and any additional rare plants identified prior to ground disturbance that are within the grading footprint or other areas identified for unavoidable disturbance (including species of CNPS Rare Plant Ranks 1-4 or Locally Rare), a Rare Plant Relocation Plan will be developed in consultation with CDFW. Plant salvage for transplanting shall take place before any clearing or grading of the sensitive plant occurs. Preliminary performance criteria, general methods of transplanting, and other anticipated components of this plan are provided in the Draft Revegetation, Rare Plant Relocation, and Oak Tree Performance Criteria provided in Appendix E3 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR.</li> </ul> |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>The Rare Plant Relocation Plan shall address mitigation for special-status plants, including topsoil salvage to preserve seed bank and management of salvaged topsoil; seed collection, storage, possible nursery propagation, and planting; salvage and planting of other plant propagules (e.g., rhizomes, bulbs) as feasible; location of receptor sites to include on- or off-site property that could serve as permanent open space areas; land protection instruments for receptor areas; and funding mechanisms. The Rare Plant Relocation Plan shall include methods, monitoring, reporting, success criteria, adaptive management, and contingencies for achieving success. Where feasible, background data for up to 3 years will be collected on receptor sites.</li> </ul>                                  |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| If rare plant relocation cannot be achieved, through lack of receptor sites, or lack of success during the monitoring  |                 |                      |                      |                               |

| Mitigation Measure /  | Project Design Measure  | Action Required | Mitigation<br>Timing | Responsible<br>Party | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|---|---|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| period, then purchase of n<br>property with known popu<br>for inclusion in permanent<br>conservation easement wo<br>priority given to acquisition   | nitigation credits or offsite<br>Ilations of the affected species<br>open space areas or a<br>ould be implemented, with<br>n of offsite property.   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>Locations within CCL that wadjacent to existing popula<br/>serve as receptor sites, and<br/>additional data. If found susties may be conserved an<br/>bulbs (e.g., <i>Calochortus</i> spi<br/><i>peirsonii</i>), and entire plant<br/><i>basilaris</i> var. <i>basilaris</i>), ma<br/>planted on these sites, and<br/>maintenance of plantings i<br/>Relocation Plan shall have<br/>transplant methods.</li> </ul> | will not be developed are present<br>ation of these species that may<br>d would be investigated for<br>uitable, topsoil from impacted<br>d placed on these sites, seeds,<br>p.), rhizomes (e.g., <i>Calystegia</i><br>s and pads (e.g., <i>Opuntia</i><br>y be collected/salvaged and<br>d ongoing monitoring and<br>mplemented. The Rare Plant<br>the final details of plant |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>The on-site receptor/mitig<br/>for a minimum of 5 years t<br/>or failure, consistent with t<br/>Plant Relocation, and Oak<br/>provided in Appendix E3 or<br/>Relocation Plan. If necessa<br/>with the approved plan wo<br/>mitigation objectives.</li> </ul>   | ation sites would be monitored<br>o determine mitigation success<br>the Draft Revegetation, Rare<br>Tree Performance Criteria<br>f the Final EIR and the Rare Plant<br>ry, remedial measures consistent<br>buld be implemented to satisfy   |                 |                      |                      |                               |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   |    | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing   | Responsible<br>Party         | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party   |
|---|----|--|--|------------------------------|---|
| <b>BR-10:</b> Preconstruction surveys by qualified biologists shall be conducted for special-status wildlife species in impact areas prior to ground-disturbing activities, and if necessary and feasible, resource relocation or avoidance for special-status species shall be implemented. Wherever practical, relocation   | Α. | Conduct preconstruction special-<br>status wildlife species surveys.   | Prior to ground-<br>disturbing activities                                  | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist | CDFW and/or<br>USFWS , Permittee'<br>s Registered<br>Forester or<br>Biologist, LACDRP |
| <ul> <li>shall be passive, allowing animals to exit the area on their own.<br/>Any grubbing, grading or other ground disturbing activities at<br/>CCL would be done in a manner that encourages mobile wildlife<br/>species to leave the Project area to escape safely into<br/>immediately adjacent undisturbed habitat, wherever feasible.</li> <li>For low mobility species, salvage and relocation by a qualified<br/>biological monitor would be implemented. Resource relocation<br/>shall be to a location deemed suitable for successful relocation<br/>by a qualified biologist and conducted by individuals with<br/>appropriate handling permits as required by CDFW or USFWS.</li> <li>Where practical, avoidance zones shall be established in lieu of<br/>relocation with fencing and/or signage that restricts access.</li> <li>Construction and construction monitoring for animals will occur<br/>at discrete time periods. Construction monitoring shall be<br/>conducted in areas containing native vegetation at the time of<br/>construction activity within the limit of active construction<br/>disturbance. Within areas containing native vegetation, ground-<br/>disturbing activities shall be prohibited until the area is cleared<br/>by a qualified biological monitor during a preconstruction survey<br/>within 7 days prior to the beginning of construction activities.</li> <li>Biological monitors shall also monitor construction activities<br/>within 100 feet of avoided CDFW and USACE jurisdictional<br/>drainages.</li> <li>For burrowing owl, suitable burrows will be identified<br/>during surveys and if feasible, protected from disturbance<br/>during construction. If avoidance is not feasible, burrows<br/>will be scoped during the non-breeding season (September<br/>1 to January 31) to determine if they are occupied. If<br/>unoccupied, burrows will be collapsed. If burrows are<br/>occupied, owls will be evicted by installing one-way doors<br/>in burrow openings during the non-breeding season to<br/>exclude burrowing owls. After eviction, burrows will be<br/>collapsed. If feasible, alternative man-made burrows will be</li> </ul> | В. | Implement resource relocation or<br>avoidance (if necessary and<br>feasible) as specified in Mitigation<br>Measure BR-10, including agency<br>coordination, acquisition of<br>appropriate handling permits, field<br>monitoring, clearance sweeps,<br>avoidance zones. | Prior to<br>construction, during<br>construction, and<br>post construction | CCL / Qualified<br>Botanist  | CDFW and/or<br>USFWS, Permittee'<br>s Registered<br>Forester or<br>Biologist, LACDRP  |

| Table 1. Chiquita Canyon Langhii Master Plan Revision Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program | Table 1. Chiquita Can | on Landfill Master Plan Re | vision Mitigation Monitorin | g and Reporting Program |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|

|   | Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  | Action Required | Mitigation<br>Timing | Responsible<br>Party | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|---|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
|   | installed on lands not subjected to construction<br>disturbance, and within 300 feet of cleared burrows.<br>Surveys would be consistent with the CDFW requirements<br>for burrowing owl survey; mitigation measures presented<br>here are consistent with CDFW (2012), and details of how<br>mitigation would be implemented would be consistent with<br>this document.  |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| • | For special-status reptiles (coast patch-nosed snake, coastal<br>western whiptail, California legless lizard, San Diego horned<br>lizard), preconstruction surveys in areas where land<br>clearing will occur shall consist of gently raking areas of<br>soft soils, sand, and dense leaf litter to identify individuals<br>burrowed or buried in leaf litter. Individuals encountered<br>will be captured and translocated to an area of<br>undisturbed, intact habitat nearby deemed suitable for<br>successful translocation by a qualified biologist.<br>Translocation will be performed by biologists with<br>appropriate handling permits by CDFW.   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| • | Special-status land mammals (San Diego black-tailed<br>jackrabbit, San Diego desert woodrat, American badger):<br>pre-construction surveys will consist of surveying and<br>identifying evidence of occupancy and use, including rabbit<br>forms, woodrat nests, and badger natal dens. If located<br>during the breeding season for these species, features will<br>be surveyed or scoped to determine occupancy if possible.<br>If unoccupied, they will be dismantled or collapsed. If<br>occupied, or if occupancy cannot be determined, avoidance<br>zones will be established until occupancy can be<br>determined or until the breeding season concludes.<br>If features are identified during the non-breeding season,<br>they will be gently dismantled or collapsed, allowing any<br>occupants if present to disperse. Where habitat must be<br>dismantled, alternative habitat features will be established<br>in nearby undisturbed areas, including creating specific<br>conditions suitable for the species if necessary, such as<br>downed wood structures in shade suitable for woodrat. |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| • | For western spadefoot, if ground-disturbing activities will be conducted within 1,000 feet of the sedimentation basins   |                 |                      |                      |                               |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   | Action Required | Mitigation<br>Timing | Responsible<br>Party | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| at CCL, preconstruction ground surveys shall occur within<br>1,000 feet of potential breeding ponds (sediment basins).<br>The top 6 inches of soft soils and leaf litter shall be gently<br>raked and small mammal burrows and soil cracks will be<br>inspected or scoped for aestivating spadefoot. In addition,<br>silt fencing will be installed between upland habitat slated<br>for vegetation removal and grading, and potential breeding<br>ponds (detention basins), if the basins are holding water at<br>the time of construction, with pitfall traps located along the<br>silt fence. Depending on proposed scheduling of upland<br>habitat disturbance (relative to spadefoot breeding<br>season), fencing and pitfall traps will target spadefoot<br>moving from or to the upland habitat. Pitfall traps will be<br>inspected daily when active, which will be during periods of<br>likely spadefoot emergence or movement (during early<br>season rainfall and pool formation and during late season<br>drawdown of the basins). If found or trapped, western<br>spadefoot will be relocated to suitable natural or artificial<br>burrows adjacent to a proposed western spadefoot<br>mitigation pond (BR-16). This pond will serve as an<br>alternative habitat for spadefoot found at CCL, and will be<br>set aside to support spadefoot breeding with adjacent<br>upland habitat for aestivation. Any aestivating western<br>spadefoot encountered during construction within 1,000<br>feet of sedimentation basins would be relocated to the<br>spadefoot mitigation pond, and placed in similar habitat<br>and conditions. Details of spadefoot mitigation, to include |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| components described above including the spadefoot<br>mitigation pond, will be documented in a Spadefoot<br>Mitigation Plan, to be reviewed by CDFW and LADRP.  |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>Bird nests: Preconstruction surveys for nesting pairs, nests,<br/>and eggs shall occur in areas proposed for vegetation<br/>removal and in surrounding areas, including cliff sites, and<br/>active nesting areas flagged. Mitigation shall be<br/>implemented as described below under BR-13.</li> </ul>  |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>Bat Roosts: Where bat roosting habitat cannot be avoided,<br/>preconstruction surveys consisting of exit surveys, roost<br/>surveys of potential roost sites, and evidence of bat sign</li> </ul>  |                 |                      |                      |                               |

| Table 1. Chiquita Can | von Landfill Master Plan Rev | sion Mitigation Monitorin | g and Reporting Program |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| rabie II eniquita eur |                              |                           |                         |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  |    | Action Required   | Mitigation<br>Timing                                   | Responsible<br>Party                                      | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party                                   |
|--|----|---|--|---|---|
| (guano) shall occur to identify bat species, as feasible, and active roosts. Mitigation shall be implemented as described below under BR-14.   |    |   |  |   |   |
| <b>BR-11:</b> USFWS protocol-level surveys shall be conducted for all coastal California gnatcatcher habitat well in advance of any ground-disturbing activities. If surveys are negative, the species shall be presumed absent, and no further impacts shall be anticipated or mitigation measures required.  | Α. | Conduct USFWS protocol-level<br>surveys for coastal California<br>gnatcatcher well in advance of<br>ground-disturbing activities. | Well in advance of ground-disturbing activities        | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist                              | USFWS, ,<br>Permittee' s<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist |
| If the surveys are positive (i.e., coastal California gnatcatcher is present), then coordination shall be initiated with USFWS on required measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate take of this   |    |   |  |   |   |
| <ul> <li>species. These are anticipated to include:</li> <li>Construction activities in the vicinity of active gnatcatcher nests shall be prohibited within a specified distance of nests (500 feet unless otherwise agreed to by USFWS) until after the young have fledged and the nesting is complete.</li> </ul>  | В. | Coordinate with USFWS if surveys<br>are positive and implement<br>required measures to avoid,<br>minimize, or mitigate take.      | Prior to and during<br>ground-disturbing<br>activities | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist /<br>Construction<br>Manager | USFWS, ,<br>Permittee' s<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist |
| <ul> <li>Clearing of occupied habitat shall be avoided if possible or<br/>practicable. If it is not practicable, clearing shall be<br/>prohibited during the nesting season (February to August).</li> </ul>   |    |   |  |   |   |
| BR-12: Although no nighttime construction is anticipated,       A         lighting for construction activities conducted during early       A         morning or early evening hours shall be minimized to the extent       possible through the use of directional shading to minimize         impacts to nocturnal or crepuscular wildlife. Only CDFW-       R         recommended designs for lighting, fences, power poles, or other       B | Α. | Use directional shading for<br>construction lighting to minimize<br>impacts to nocturnal or<br>crepuscular wildlife.              | During construction                                    | CCL / Construction<br>Manager                             | LADRP   |
|  | В. | Implement only CDFW-<br>recommended designs for lighting,<br>fences, power poles, or other man-<br>made features where available. | During Project<br>design                               | CCL / Construction<br>Manager                             | CDFW  |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   |    | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing  | Responsible<br>Party                                      | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party           |
|---|----|--|---|---|---|
| <b>BR-13:</b> In habitats where nesting birds might occur, vegetation removal shall be avoided when feasible during the nesting season (December through August); winter months are included because this area has potential for owls and hummingbirds, which may breed during this period. In addition, raptor nesting may be initiated by early January. Where this is not feasible, preconstruction surveys for nesting pairs, nests, and eggs shall occur in areas proposed for vegetation removal, and in buffer areas affected by construction, and active nesting areas flagged. The biological monitor shall assign a buffer around active nesting areas (typically 300 feet for songbirds, 500 feet for raptors, and 1,000 feet for sensitive cliff-nesting raptors – golden eagle, prairie falcon, and turkey vulture). The biological monitor will also clearly communicate the limits of buffers to the contractor and crew, and post and maintain, throughout the time of nest use, flagging, fencing, staking, or signs as otherwise needed. Construction activities shall be prohibited within the buffer until the nesting pair and young have vacated the nests, unless it can be demonstrated through biological monitoring that the construction surveys, nests may be destroyed prior to active nesting. Rocky escarpments that may support cliff-nesting raptors not proposed for current construction activity. | Α. | Avoid vegetation removal in nesting bird habitat during the nesting season.  | During Project<br>construction  | CCL / Construction<br>Manager                             | LADRP                                   |
|   | В. | Conduct preconstruction nesting<br>bird surveys where vegetation<br>avoidance is not feasible and flag<br>active nesting areas.  | Prior to vegetation<br>removal in nesting<br>bird habitat   | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist                              | LADRP, CDFW,<br>USFWS,                  |
|   | C. | Assign buffers around active nests,<br>clearly communicate limits to<br>contractor/crew, and post and<br>maintain flagging, fencing, and<br>staking.                   | During Project<br>construction  | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist /<br>Construction<br>Manager | LADRP, CDFW,<br>USFWS                   |
|   | D. | Prohibit construction activities<br>within buffer until nests are<br>vacated, or unless biological<br>monitoring can demonstrate<br>activity is not hindering nesting. | During Project<br>design  | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist /<br>Construction<br>Manager | LADRP, CDFW,<br>USFWS,<br>CDFW<br>USFWS |
|   | E. | Destroy unused nests in the disturbance area prior to active nesting.  | Prior to vegetation<br>removal in nesting<br>bird habitat, and<br>following<br>preconstruction<br>surveys | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist                              | LADRP, CDFW,<br>USFWS, CDFW<br>USFWS    |
| <b>BR-14:</b> A qualified bat biologist acceptable to CDFW shall be<br>employed to supervise and report on construction activities with<br>respect to bats. In habitats where roosting bats may occur,<br>ground disturbance and roost destruction shall be scheduled, as<br>feasible, during October 1 through February 28 or 29. Ground<br>disturbance and roost destruction shall be avoided during the<br>parturition period (generally March through August). Where this<br>is not feasible, a qualified bat biologist shall conduct exit  | Α. | Employ qualified bat biologist to<br>supervise and report on<br>construction activities with respect<br>to bats.   | During Project<br>construction  | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist                              | LADRP                                   |
|   | В. | Schedule ground disturbance and<br>roost destruction in bat roost<br>habitat to avoid the parturition<br>period.   | During Project<br>construction  | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist /<br>Construction<br>Manager | LADRP                                   |

| Table 1. Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Prog | gram |
|---|------|
|---|------|

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   |    | Action Required   | Mitigation<br>Timing  | Responsible<br>Party                                      | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|---|----|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| surveys, roost surveys of potential roost sites, or surveys for bat<br>sign (e.g., guano) to identify bat species, if feasible, and active<br>roosts. Construction activity within 300 feet of identified active<br>roosts shall be prohibited until the completion of parturition<br>(end of August), unless it can be demonstrated through<br>biological monitoring that the construction activity is not<br>affecting the active roost. Alternatively, if potential roosts are<br>identified prior to enset of parturition with concurrence from   | C. | Conduct exit surveys, roost<br>surveys of potential roost sites, or<br>surveys for bat sign (e.g., guano) to<br>identify bat species and active<br>roosts if ground disturbance<br>cannot be scheduled outside<br>parturition period. | Prior to disturbance<br>activities in active<br>roost areas within<br>the parturition<br>period             | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist /<br>Construction<br>Manager | LADRP, CDFW,                  |
| CDFW, roosts may be vacated during the evening forage period<br>(within 4 hours after dark) or fitted with one way exit doors to<br>effectively eliminate and exclude roosting bats. If tree roosts are<br>identified that require disturbance, and from which bats can't<br>be excluded, the trees would be initially disturbed by cutting<br>small branches (less than 2 inches) to encourage habitat   | D. | Prohibit construction activities<br>within 300 feet of active roosts<br>until completion of parturition, or<br>unless biological monitoring can<br>demonstrate activity is not<br>affecting active roost.                             | During Project<br>construction  | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist /<br>Construction<br>Manager | LADRP, CDFW,                  |
| abandonment, prior to full tree removal (implemented the<br>following day and supervised by a qualified bat biologist). Roost<br>eviction will be conducted by a qualified bat biologist. Eviction<br>shall be preferentially done before March or after September<br>for eviction of a maternity colony, and only with concurrence<br>from CDFW. If eviction is necessary, the bat biologist shall<br>identify the bat species to be evicted, as feasible, and roost sites<br>appropriate to the species to be displaced in the vicinity (within<br>1 mile) prior to any bat eviction. Alternative active roost areas,<br>including rock escarpments at CCL that are not proposed to be<br>disturbed by current construction activity would be avoided for<br>the duration of the construction activity. If no alternative roost<br>sites are identified, CCL shall provide artificial roost construction<br>appropriate to the bat species to be displaced to offset loss of<br>active roosts. Artificial roost construction would follow industry<br>standard design, be sized to offset impacted roost(s), and be<br>located greater than 300 feet from the active construction area,<br>but within CCL property. A report will be prepared for submittal<br>to CDFW and copied to LADRP on activities related to bat<br>surveys and eviction, including survey methods, findings<br>including species and size of roosts if available, alternative roost<br>locations and characteristics, and constructed roosts. | E. | Exclude roosts (with CDFW<br>concurrence) prior to onset of<br>parturition, as identified in<br>Mitigation Measure BR-14<br>(including requirements for<br>artificial roost construction and<br>reporting).                           | Prior to disturbance<br>activities in active<br>roost areas, and<br>following<br>preconstruction<br>surveys | CCL / Qualified<br>Biologist                              | LADRP, CDFW,                  |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   |    | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing   | Responsible<br>Party | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party  |
|---|----|--|--|----------------------|--|
| <b>BR-15:</b> For unavoidable impacts to qualifying oak trees, an Oak Tree Permit application has been submitted to the LADRP. All permit terms and conditions shall be complied with from the final permit issuance, including planting of replacement trees. An Oak Tree and Woodland Mitigation Plan which identifies the  | Α. | Comply with Oak Tree permit<br>terms and conditions, including<br>planting of replacement trees. | During Project<br>construction and<br>post construction  | CCL                  | LADRP,<br>Permittee's<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist           |
| mitigation area shall be submitted to LADRP for review and<br>approval prior to impacts to any scrub oaks or issuance of a<br>grading permit for the Proposed Project that would disturb<br>areas within the protected zone of any oak trees regulated by<br>the County Oak Tree Ordinance. The site shall be assessed for<br>oak woodlands, including scrub oaks, at the time of disturbance<br>according to the County Oak Woodland Conservation and<br>Management Plan, and the Oak Tree and Woodland Mitigation           | В. | Submit Oak Tree and Woodland<br>Mitigation Plan.   | Prior to any impacts<br>to oak woodlands,<br>including scrub<br>oaks, or issuance of<br>a grading permit<br>where any oaks are<br>to be impacted | CCL                  | LADRP,<br>Permittee's<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist           |
| Plan would also address mitigation for oak woodland witigation<br>Plan would also address mitigation for oak woodland impacts,<br>including scrub oaks. As appropriate, potential impacts to oak<br>woodlands shall be mitigated by planting understory plants in<br>the same area identified onsite for mitigation oaks pursuant to<br>the Oak Tree Permit and Oak Tree and Woodland Mitigation<br>Plan for the Proposed Project.  | C. | Implement approved Oak Tree and<br>Woodland Mitigation Plan.                                     | During Project<br>construction and<br>post construction  | CCL                  | LADRP,<br>Permittee's<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist           |
| CCL will coordinate with Tataviam to provide a monitor during<br>the removal or disturbance of native oak trees at CCL, if desired<br>by the tribe.   |    |  |  |                      |  |
| <b>BR-16:</b> To avoid operational impacts to western spadefoot<br>which may occur during intentional draining of detention basins,<br>or sediment removal from detention basins, the following<br>protocol must be implemented, under an approach coordinated<br>with CDFW: (1) All drainage equipment would be new or used<br>exclusively for detention basins on CCL to avoid transfer of<br>Chytridiomycosis (i.e., chytrid fungus) or any other amphibian<br>diseases or pathogens to detention basins on CCL from other | Α. | Coordinate approach for draining<br>or removing sediment from<br>detention basins with CDFW.     | Prior to draining or<br>removing sediment<br>from detention<br>basins  | CCL                  | CDFW,<br>Permittee's<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist,<br>LACDPW |

| sites; (2) pumping equipment intakes would be screened with<br>fine mesh and would pump from deeper portions of the<br>detention ponds to ensure that eggs, larvae, or adults of<br>western spadefoot would not be entrained in pump apparatus;<br>(3) if a biological monitor determines that spadefoot adults,<br>larvae, or egg masses are present during pumping, a secondary<br>pump enclosure with maximum pore size of 0.125 inches will be<br>utilized if determined necessary by the biological monitor;<br>(4) at any given pumping event, only 80 percent of the volume<br>(measured as depth at the deepest point of the detention basin)<br>would be pumped, leaving pooled water of at least a 5-inch<br>depth for any potential western spadefoot to complete its life<br>cycle; however, the biological monitor would evaluate<br>remaining pooled water volume and spadefoot development<br>stage and make a determination if the remaining water was<br>sufficient for spadefoot to complete their life cycle; and (5)<br>sediment removal would only occur during the dry season,<br>when ponded water was not present. A Spadefoot Mitigation<br>Plan will be developed in consultation with CDFW, to<br>incorporate the above measures and other measures in BR-10 to<br>protect spadefoot. The Spadefoot Mitigation Plan will include<br>design and development of a spadefoot breeding pond on CCL<br>property in a relatively undisturbed location where adjacent<br>uplands are present, including 1,000 feet of undeveloped land<br>as feasible. This pond will be suitable for establishment of a<br>western spadefoot breeding pond, and will not undergo the<br>regular maintenance that is necessary for the onsite stormwater<br>detention basins. Relocation of western spadefoot will be to the<br>mitigation pond.<br><b>Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources</b> | Action Required   | Mitigation<br>Timing  | Responsible<br>Party                         | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <b>CR-1:</b> A qualified archaeologist will flag off the area around A  | B. Implement protocol for draining or<br>removing sediment from<br>detention basins, as coordinated<br>with CDFW and identified in<br>Mitigation Measure BR-16. | During detention<br>basin draining or<br>sediment removal<br>activities | CCL / Operations<br>Manager                  | CDFW,<br>Permittee's<br>Registered Forester<br>or Biologist,<br>LACDPW |
| Permittee to ensure avoidance of grading of the cave site.  | A. Flag off the area around Bowers<br>Cave and establish a buffer in<br>consultation with CCL.  | Prior to earth-<br>moving activities                                    | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Qualified | LADRP  |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing  | Responsible<br>Party   | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party                                |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| grading must not occur beyond the established buffer. The<br>qualified archeologist will monitor earth-moving activities that<br>would occur within 100 feet of the established buffer.   | <ul> <li>B. Depict sensitive area on grading<br/>plans and state that grading must<br/>not occur beyond the established<br/>buffer.</li> </ul> | During<br>development of<br>grading plans   | CCL / Qualified<br>Engineer                                    | LADRP  |
|   | C. Archaeological monitoring and reporting.  | During earth-<br>moving activities<br>within 100 feet of<br>the established<br>buffer | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Qualified<br>Archaeologist  | LADRP  |
| <b>CR-2:</b> Prior to the start of monitoring activities, a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan (CRMP) will be developed. The CRMP will include, at a minimum: (1) the location of areas to be monitored, (2) frequency of monitoring, (3) description of resources expected to be encountered, (4) description of circumstances that would result in a construction halt, (5) description of monitoring reporting requirements, and (6) disposition of found/collected materials. | Develop a CRMP.  | Prior to<br>construction  | CCL / Qualified<br>Archaeologist                               | LADRP  |
| <b>CR-3:</b> Native American consultation has indicated that Bowers<br>Cave and the surrounding region may be important to local<br>Native Americans, specifically Tataviam. Provisions will be made<br>to provide cave access to interested Tataviam, and Tataviam<br>will have the option to provide a construction oversight monitor<br>during ground-disturbing activities. The Tataviam monitor will   | <ul> <li>Make provisions to provide<br/>Bower's Cave access to interested<br/>Tataviam.</li> </ul>   | Prior to and during construction  | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Tataviam Native<br>American | LADRP<br>Native American<br>Heritage<br>Commission<br>(NAHC) |
| act as a liaison between archaeologists, the Permittee,<br>contractors, and public agencies to ensure that cultural features<br>are treated appropriately from the Tataviam point of view. All<br>artifacts that may be found will be returned to the Tataviam or<br>reinterred into the earth  | B. Tataviam Native American<br>monitoring and reporting and<br>liaison activities, as applicable.  | During construction   | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Tataviam Native<br>American | LADRP<br>NAHC  |
|   | C. Return all artifacts that may be found to the Tataviam or reinterred into the earth.  | During construction   | CCL / Construction<br>Manager /<br>Tataviam Native<br>American | LADRP<br>NAHC  |

| Table 1. Chiqu | uita Canvon | ı Landfill Master | r Plan Revision | Mitigation Monit | oring and Re | porting Program |
|----------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
|                |             |                   |                 |                  |              |                 |

personnel shall be provided to the landfill manager.

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   | Action Required   | Mitigation<br>Timing                 | Responsible<br>Party  | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>CR-4:</b> Prior to construction, the services of a qualified vertebrate paleontologist shall be retained to develop and implement a Paleontological Resources Mitigation Plan prior to earth moving activities. The Plan will include the following elements:  | Retain a qualified vertebrate<br>paleontologist to develop and<br>implement a Paleontological Resources<br>Mitigation Plan (PRMP).  | Prior to earth-<br>moving activities | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate<br>Paleontologist                                       | LADRP                         |
| <ul> <li>development of agreement with a recognized museum repository;</li> </ul>   |   |                                      |   |                               |
| <ul> <li>identification of final disposition, permanent storage, and<br/>maintenance of any fossil remains and associated specimen<br/>data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data<br/>that might be recovered; and</li> </ul>   |   |                                      |   |                               |
| <ul> <li>determination of level of treatment (preparation, curation,<br/>cataloguing) of the remains that would be required before<br/>the mitigation program fossil collection would be accepted<br/>for storage.</li> </ul>   |   |                                      |   |                               |
| <b>CR-5:</b> The paleontologist and/or monitor shall conduct a preconstruction survey of the Project site prior to the start of any earth moving associated with the landfill expansion.  | Preconstruction survey.   | Prior to earth-<br>moving activities | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate<br>Paleontologist<br>and/or<br>Environmental<br>Monitor | LADRP                         |
| <b>CR-6:</b> The paleontologist or monitor shall coordinate with landfill personnel to provide information regarding regulatory agency requirements for the protection of paleontological resources. Landfill personnel also will be briefed on procedures to be followed in the event that a fossil site or fossil occurrence is encountered during construction, particularly when the monitor is not performed to now. | A. Coordinate with landfill personnel<br>to provide information regarding<br>regulatory agency requirements<br>and procedures for the protection<br>of paleontological resources. | Prior to and during construction     | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate<br>Paleontologist<br>and/or<br>Environmental<br>Monitor | LADRP                         |
| landfill personnel as necessary. Names and telephone numbers<br>of the monitor and other appropriate mitigation program   | B. Brief landfill personnel on<br>procedures when a fossil site or  | Prior to and during construction     | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate   | LADRP                         |

fossil is encountered during

construction.

#### Table 1. Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Paleontologist

and/or

Environmental Monitor

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing             | Responsible<br>Party  | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
|  | C. Provide monitor and mitigation<br>program contact information to<br>the landfill manager.   | Prior to and during construction | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate<br>Paleontologist<br>and/or<br>Environmental<br>Monitor | LADRP                         |
| <b>CR-7:</b> Earth-moving activities shall be monitored by the paleontologist only in those areas of the Project site where these activities would disturb previously undisturbed strata in the Saugus and upper Pico Formations (not in areas underlain by artificial fill or younger alluvium). With concurrence from the Project paleontologist, if no fossil remains are found once 50 percent of earth moving has been completed in an area | <ul> <li>A. Paleontological monitoring in areas of the Project site where activities would disturb previously undisturbed strata in the Saugus and upper Pico Formations (not in areas underlain by artificial fill or younger alluvium).</li> </ul>   | During construction              | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate<br>Paleontologist                                       | LADRP                         |
| or suspended in that area.   | <ul> <li>B. Paleontological monitoring and reporting.</li> </ul>   | During construction              | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate<br>Paleontologist                                       | LADRP                         |
| <b>CR-8:</b> All diagnostic fossil specimens recovered from the Project site shall be treated (prepared, curated, catalogued) in accordance with designated museum repository requirements.  | Treat all diagnostic fossil specimens<br>recovered from the Project site in<br>accordance with designated museum<br>repository requirements. Treatment of<br>recovered fossil specimens would be<br>documented in final paleontological<br>technical report prepared by the<br>Project paleontologist. | During and after construction    | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate<br>Paleontologist                                       | LADRP                         |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  | Action Required   | Mitigation<br>Timing  | Responsible<br>Party  | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|--|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>CR-9:</b> The monitor shall maintain daily monitoring logs. A final technical report of results and findings shall be prepared by the paleontologist and included with the material submitted for curation (see above).   | A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance.   | During construction   | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate<br>Paleontologist<br>and/or<br>Environmental<br>Monitor | LADRP                         |
|  | <ul> <li>B. Prepare and submit a final paleontological technical report.</li> </ul>               | Following earth-<br>moving activities<br>within previously<br>undisturbed strata<br>in the Saugus and<br>upper Pico<br>Formations | CCL / Qualified<br>Vertebrate<br>Paleontologist                                       | LADRP                         |
| Air Quality  |   |   |   |                               |
| <b>AQ-1:</b> CCL shall use certified street sweepers that comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1186.1.  | Use certified street sweepers.  | During construction   | CCL / Construction<br>Manager   | , LEA                         |
| <b>AQ-2:</b> CCL shall use innovative approaches to reducing potential air emissions from construction of buildings, such as modular building products, where prefabricated portions of structures are assembled elsewhere and are erected at the construction site, as feasible. This would eliminate the need for onsite painting, a majority of the plumbing, and other consumer product usage. | Incorporate air emissions reducing<br>provisions for construction of building<br>into the design. | During Project<br>design  | CCL   | , LACDPW                      |
| <b>AQ-3:</b> CCL shall provide offsetting emission reduction credits for predicted net emission increases from sources requiring permitting under New Source Review regulations.   | Provide offsetting emission reduction credits.  | During permitting   | CCL   | SCAQMD                        |
| <b>AQ-4:</b> Prior to operation of the composting facility, CCL shall develop an Odor Impact Minimization Plan (OIMP) pursuant to the requirements of the <i>California Code of Regulations</i> (CCR), Title 14. Division 7. Chapter 3.1. Article 3. and Section 17963.4:  | A. Develop OIMP.  | Prior to operation<br>of composting<br>facility   | CCL   | LEA, LACDPW                   |
| CCL shall comply with the OIMP during compost facility operation.  | B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance.   | During operation of composting facility   | CCL   | LEA, LACDPW                   |

|                  | Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure   | Action Required                        | Mitigation<br>Timing | Responsible<br>Party | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|------------------|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| i<br>i<br>i<br>F | Current Emission Reduction Measures: CCL currently<br>mplements the following emission reduction measures on an<br>ongoing basis, and these measures would continue to be<br>mplemented during construction and operation of the<br>proposed Project. | Maintain log demonstrating compliance. | Ongoing              | CCL                  | , LEA, LACDPW                 |
| •                | Onsite traffic is managed.  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Engine-powered equipment is properly maintained.  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Onsite vehicles are routed along the most direct routes.  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Electrically powered equipment is used to the extent feasible.  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | A 15 mile per hour (mph) speed limit is enforced on paved roads and 10 mph speed limit on unpaved roads.  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Permanent onsite haul roads are paved, to the extent feasible.  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Temporary unpaved roads are surfaced with low-dust courses of material.   |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Roads are watered four to seven times daily, dependent on conditions, including weather.  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Active sites of soil disturbance are watered four to seven times daily, dependent on conditions, including weather.   |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Soil stabilizers are used in areas with long-term exposure of disturbed or un-vegetated surfaces (e.g., stockpiles).  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Trucks hauling dirt, sand, or other loose materials for site<br>construction projects on public roadways are covered or<br>maintain at least 2 feet of free board in accordance with<br>the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114.    |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Construction access roads are paved at least 100 feet onto the site from the main road.   |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Where feasible, other construction roads not covered by<br>the above measure heaving a daily traffic volume of<br>50 vehicular trips, are paved; where infeasible, these roads<br>are watered.  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| •                | Disturbed areas are covered with erosion control materials if needed.   |  |                      |                      |                               |

Table 1. Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  | Action Required                        | Mitigation<br>Timing | Responsible<br>Party | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|--|--|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| <ul> <li>SCAQMD-approved street sweepers are used on all paved<br/>haul roads onsite as needed during rainy periods to reduce<br/>mud and during dry periods to reduce dust.</li> </ul>                                  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| Construction Emission Reduction Best Management Practices (BMPs):  | Maintain log demonstrating compliance. | During construction  | CCL                  | , LEA, LACDPW                 |
| • The construction equipment, not owned by CCL, would be equipped with engines meeting California Air Resources Board (CARB) requirements for a large fleet at the time of construction (13 CCR 2449).                   |  |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>The construction equipment, not owned by CCL, would be<br/>equipped with engines meeting Tier 4f emission standards<br/>after Project year 2020.</li> </ul>   |  |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>Trucks would be prevented from idling longer than 5<br/>minutes, to the extent feasible.</li> </ul>   |  |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>Construction equipment idling times and excessive use<br/>would be prevented, to the extent feasible.</li> </ul>  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| • Use of construction equipment would be suspended during Stage 2 and 3 smog alerts.   |  |                      |                      |                               |
| <ul> <li>To reduce/minimize construction-related fugitive dust,<br/>water would be applied four to seven times daily,<br/>dependent on weather, within the construction site.</li> </ul>                                 |  |                      |                      |                               |
| • Fugitive dust from vehicle travel on unpaved roads would be controlled through the application of water 4 to 7 times daily, dependent on weather.  |  |                      |                      |                               |
| Operation Emission Reduction BMPs:   | Maintain log demonstrating             | During operation     | CCL                  | LEA, LACDPW                   |
| <ul> <li>Off-road diesel equipment purchased by CCL for operation<br/>of the Proposed Project (used for additional waste<br/>received) would be equipped with engines meeting Tier 4f<br/>emission standards.</li> </ul> | compliance.                            |                      |                      |                               |
|  |  |                      |                      |                               |

Unnecessary truck and equipment idling would be limited to less than 5 minutes, to the extent feasible.
Use of all off-road diesel equipment would be suspended

 Use of all off-road diesel equipment would be suspended during Stage 2 and 3 smog alerts (SCAQMD, 1993), to the extent feasible.

|                                | Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  |    | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing                    | Responsible<br>Party | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|--------------------------------|--|----|--|---|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| •                              | Fugitive dust BMPs for vehicle travel on paved roads,<br>vehicle travel on unpaved roads, and soil disturbance<br>would be the same as described above for construction.   |    |  |   |                      |                               |
| •                              | Operate the landfill to improve landfill gas collection<br>efficiency to a site-wide average of 85 percent through<br>application of a combination of daily cover, intermediate<br>cover, and final cover to provide a beneficial improvement<br>in ongoing landfill gas collection efficiency.                                  |    |  |   |                      |                               |
| •                              | The existing, approved landfill gas-to-energy (LFGTE) plant<br>would be optimized to use collected landfill gas (LFG) as<br>fuel to produce electricity and to minimize flaring of<br>collected LFG.   |    |  |   |                      |                               |
| Cor                            | nposting Emission Reduction BMPs:  | Α. | Maintain log demonstrating   | During operation of                     | CCL                  | LACDPW,                       |
| •                              | Green waste composting piles would be covered with at<br>least 6 inches of finished compost within 24 hours of initial<br>pile formation.  |    | compliance.  | composting facility                     |                      | SCAQMD, LEA                   |
| •                              | Piles would not be turned for the first 7 days of active phase composting.   |    |  |   |                      |                               |
| •                              | For the first 15 days of initial pile formation, and within 6 hours before turning, the top half of the pile would be kept wet to a depth of at least 3 inches.  | В. | Implement site-specific OIMP.  | During operation of composting facility | CCL                  | LACDPW,<br>SCAQMD, LEA        |
| •                              | Covered, aerated composting system would be equipped<br>with an SCAQMD-approved emission control system (e.g.,<br>thermal oxidizer, bio-filtration) (SCAQMD, 2015).  |    |  |   |                      |                               |
| •                              | Composting facility would implement a site-specific Odor<br>Impact Minimization Plan (OIMP).   |    |  |   |                      |                               |
| Lan                            | dfill Operation Odor Reduction Measure (ORM)   | Α. | Develop OIMP For approval by the   | Within 3 months of                      | CCL                  | SCAQMD, LEA,                  |
| OR                             | ORM-1: For landfill operation, CCL shall develop an Odor Impact  |    | responsible agencies   | receipt of CUP                          |                      | LACDPW, LADRP                 |
| Mir<br>mo<br>tha<br>des<br>des | Minimization Plan (OIMP). The OIMP will describe an odor<br>monitoring protocol, a description of meteorological conditions<br>that affect migration of odors, a complaint response protocol, a<br>description of design considerations for minimizing odors, and a<br>description of operating procedures for minimizing odors. | В. | Maintain log demonstrating<br>compliance and implementing all<br>remedial action as recommended<br>by the responsible agencies | During operation of<br>landfill         | CCL                  | SCAQMD, LEA,<br>LACDPW, LADRP |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure  | Action Required  | Mitigation<br>Timing   | Responsible<br>Party        | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change  |  |  |                             |                               |
| <b>GHG-1:</b> Beginning in 2020, the applicant shall provide the<br>Department of Regional Planning with reports every 5 years,<br>which shall evaluate consistency of landfill operations with<br>current State and County greenhouse gas (GHG) emission<br>reduction plans. If the Department of Regional Planning finds<br>that a report demonstrates that landfill operations do not meet<br>the GHG emission reduction targets of then-current State and<br>County GHG emission reduction plans, the applicant shall<br>develop and within one year submit to the Department of<br>Regional Planning for review and approval of a GHG Emission<br>Reduction Plan, which shall require implementation of<br>additional feasible GHG emission reduction measures within the<br>waste management sector to further reduce GHG emissions in<br>accordance with then-current State and County goals. The GHG | A. Provide reports evaluating<br>consistency of landfill operations<br>with current State and County<br>GHG emission reduction plans | Beginning in 2020,<br>and subsequently<br>every 5 years  | CCL                         | LADRP, LACDPW,<br>SCAQMD, LEA |
| <ul> <li>Emission Reduction Plan may incorporate some or all of the following measures:</li> <li>Further or additional composting;</li> <li>Further or additional recycling;</li> <li>Development of alternative energy, including additional landfill gas-to-energy production capacity and/or development of other on-site renewable energy generation capacity;</li> <li>Use of alternative fuels in on-site equipment; or some combination of the listed strategies; and/or</li> <li>Other waste management sector strategies developed by California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) and CARB addressing GHG emissions from waste management</li> </ul>   | B. Develop GHG Emission Reduction<br>Plan.   | Within one year, if<br>LADRP finds<br>consistency reports<br>demonstrate GHG<br>emission reduction<br>targets of then-<br>current State and<br>County GHG<br>emission reduction<br>plans are not met | CCL                         | LADRP, LACDPW,<br>SCAQMD, LEA |
| <b>GHG-2:</b> Following closure of the landfill, the applicant shall continue to operate, maintain, and monitor the landfill gas collection and control system as long as the landfill continues to produce landfill gas, or until it is determined that emissions no longer constitute a considerable contribution to GHG emissions, whichever comes first.   | Maintain monitoring log of landfill gas collection and control system.   | Following closure of the landfill  | CCL / Operations<br>Manager | SCAQMD, LACDPW                |

| Mitigation Measure / Project Design Measure                            | Action Required | Mitigation<br>Timing | Responsible<br>Party | Monitoring Agency<br>or Party |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Notes:   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| BMP = best management practice   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| Cal-IPC = California Invasive Plant Council                            |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| CalRecycle = California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| CARB = California Air Resources Board                                  |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| CCR = California Code of Regulations                                   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| CDFW = California Department of Fish and Wildlife                      |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| CRMP = Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan                              |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| CWA = Clean Water Act  |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| DTSC = California Department of Toxic Substance Control                |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| EPA = United States Environmental Protection Agency                    |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| GHG = greenhouse gas   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| LACDPW = Los Angeles County Department of Public Works                 |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| LADRP = Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning             |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| LEA = Local Enforcement Agency   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| LFG = landfill gas   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| LFGTE = landfill gas-to-energy   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| mph = miles per hour   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| NAHC = Native American Heritage Commission                             |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| OIMP = Odor Impact Minimization Plan                                   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| PRMP = Paleontological Resources Mitigation Plan                       |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District                   |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| USACE = United States Army Corps of Engineers                          |                 |                      |                      |                               |
| USFWS = United States Fish and Wildlife Service                        |                 |                      |                      |                               |

Table 1. Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

# References

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2009. *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluation Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities*.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2012. *Special-status species and vegetation communities search within 10 miles of the Project area.* California Natural Diversity Database. December.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. <?>

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2015. <?>

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2008. *Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources; Final Rule. Federal Register.* April 10.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1996. *Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical Inventories for Federally Listed, Proposed and Candidate Plants.* 



| CONSULTANT  | YYYY-MM-DD | 2017-03-31 |        |
|-------------|------------|------------|--------|
| -           | DESIGNED   | JDR        |        |
| Colden      | PREPARED   | JDR        |        |
| Associates  | REVIEWED   | RDH        |        |
|             | APPROVED   | RDH        |        |
| PROJECT NO. | RE         | EV.        | FIGURE |
| 1663646     | 0          |            | 1      |

# TITLE ELEVATION 1,430-FOOT ALTERNATIVE

PROJECT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

CLIENT WASTE CONNECTIONS, INC. CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



| From:<br>Sent:<br>To: | guillermo peraza <peraza.guillermo@gmail.com><br/>Wednesday, March 01, 2017 9:20 AM<br/>Fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Sheila@bos.lacounty.gov;<br/>MarkRidleythomas@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov;<br/>fifthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; claghorn@planning.lacounty.gov;<br/>executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov; DRP LDCC; rglaser@planning.lacounty.gov;</peraza.guillermo@gmail.com> |
|-----------------------|--|
| Subject:              | Please oppose the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion!!   |

Greetings,

The landfill has been an inconsiderate smelly neighbor to the residents of Val Verde and Castaic for too long. While Waste Connections makes money from operating the landfill to create positive sounding advertisements and give donations to keep negative press and Santa Clarita Republican leaders from speaking out against the landfill, it leaves the limited power, time, money and other resources of individual home owners to carry the burden of resisting this expansion.

Although no further expansion permits should be allowed at Chiquita, the landfill will still exist. So I believe it is probably a good idea for Waste Connections to be allowed to continue to use the methane gas generated by its Chiquita dump to produce electricity (Ref: SCV Republican call to action letter in late February explaining that it powers 10,000 homes.) Burning off the gas is a poor alternate solution. It is also a good idea to allow Waste Connections to build the waste-to-energy plant, providing they can only use the waste they have already collected.

We do not want more trucks bringing trash from other cities into our community. The fumes generated by those trucks is yet another impact of the dump on the air quality within the Santa Clarita Valley. Please do not put our air and water supply at further risk. Our environment is worth so much more than money can buy.

Sincerely,

Guillermo Peraza

From:Anita Frost <freeost45</th>Sent:Wednesday, March 07To:Richard ClaghornSubject:Proposed Chiguita Ca

Anita Frost <freeost45@gmail.com> Wednesday, March 01, 2017 2:51 PM Richard Claghorn Proposed Chiguita Canyon Landfill Expansion

Dear Mr. Claghorn,

I would like to give you a little personal background. My husband is a Vietnam vet, and we raised two sons in Torrance, CA, who both went on to graduate from the United States Military Academy at West Point. My husband and I moved to the community of Val Verde in 1992 to find a more quiet and rural environment, and have since retired there. We have watched the Santa Clarita Valley area grow and expand during those 25 years, and the 5 freeway and highway 126 experience increased congestion.

The proposed expansion of the Chiguita Canyon Landfill will have an extremely negative impact on adults and children who live, work, and commute in the surrounding areas. The people in Santa Clarita Valley account for only about 3% percent of the population of Los Angeles County, but if this expansion goes through, the Chiquita Canyon Landfill will be authorized to accept almost 50% percent of L.A. County's total in-county waste every single year. The most frightening estimate is that the expansion will cause an increase in the lifetime cancer risk for people, along with greenhouse gas emissions and operation activities that will significantly hurt the environment. Would you like your children to live and go to school in such a potentially hazardous environment, or your parents to experience such an unhealthy place?

Please put the health of children, adults, and our environment first, and do not approve this proposed expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Thank you,

Anita Frost freeost45@gmail.com

From:DRP LDCCSent:Wednesday, March 01, 2017 3:23 PMTo:Richard Claghorn; Samuel DeaSubject:FW: You have to know this before March 1, 2017Attachments:Landfill claiming they are apart of SCV Adventure Play.docx; Musella recruiting.docx;<br/>Musella's lying.docx; Musella's English fake flyer.jpg; Musella's Spanish fake flyer.jpg; Cancer<br/>risk picture from revised DEIR.png; Map of where trash comes from 1.jpg; Map of where trash<br/>comes from 2.jpg

Here is another one for Chiquita Canyon

Thank you,

Alice Wong, AICP Principal Planner Land Development Coordinating Center Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1360 Los Angeles, CA 90012 http://planning.lacounty.gov/

Department Front Counter Hours: M, Tu, Th 7:30am-5:30pm & W 8:30am-5:30pm Closed every Friday



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, attorney work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender of this email immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and immediately destroy this message, including any attachments.

From: Susie Evans [mailto:sheffs@pacbell.net] Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2017 3:27 PM To: fifthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Sheila@bos.lacounty.gov; MarkRidleythomas@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; claghorn@planning.lacounty.gov; executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov; DRP LDCC <D4@planning.lacounty.gov>; Robert Glaser <rglaser@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: You have to know this before March 1, 2017

I have attached some of the underhanded tactics of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill and their PR Rep John Musella of the Musella Group.

I have also attached map of where the trash comes from that is taken in by Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Mesquite Landfill is open and ready to accept our trash and it has been paid for by the citizens of LA County.

US Postal workers are not allowed to call about the smells that they face daily while working at the Santa Clarita Post Office. How dare anyone deny them the right to breathe or to call the authorities about the lack of proper air to breathe?

The landfill is smelly, toxic, illegal and completely unnecessary. Their contract expired already. The deal they had made with our community is that they would only dump here for 20 years. They did that and now want to renege on their agreement with our community. Please do not allow this. There are other great alternatives they have been planning for the last 20 years. They should take advantage of those, not our community. We do not want more trucks bringing trash from other cities into our community. The fumes generated by those trucks is yet another impact of the dump on the air quality within the Santa Clarita Valley. Please do not put our air and water supply at further risk. Our environment and health is worth so much more than money can buy.

Susan M. Evans 29830 Lincoln Ave. Val Verde, CA 91384 Home 661-702-9782 Celi 661-433-1380 Email <u>Sheffs@pacbell.net</u>

| From:    | sbattin@fastmail.fm  |
|----------|--|
| Sent:    | Wednesday, March 01, 2017 3:34 PM  |
| To:      | Richard Claghorn   |
| Subject: | "Planning for the Challenges Ahead" - My response to the FEIR for Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion R2004-00559-(5) |

## Dear Richard Claghorn;

I can't attend the hearing today for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill project, so I am composing this letter to issue a statement. Please ensure its delivery to the reviewing committee and carefully logue my concerns and complaints.

I lived in Val Verde when Waste Connections first announced their hope to expand the Chiquita Canyon landfill. I attended their first public information session held in the community center of Val Verde. My neighbors and I sat in the community hall and were bewildered by the presentation- the Waste Connections co. which had time and time again promised to close the doors of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, was once again attempting to 1) remain open AND 2) double its daily intake and footprint. The profits of this out-of-state corporation come at a great cost. This cost is being paid acutely by the members of Val Verde in the form of health risks, disease, loss of a healthy environment which includes clean air and the freedom to breath without the morbid stench of California's broken waste management system<sup>\*</sup>. I lived on Madison Way in Val Verde, and would smell this stench regularly every evening around 11pm. I often called the AQMD to report the air conditions.

However long-term consequences of this project are what concern me most. These consequences will be paid by our future generations of LA county residents at large. Landfills as waste cycling system are antiquated. They are destructive and unnecessarily contribute to green house gases, climate change, and imperil regional biodiversity. Now is the time to make the changes we know are healthy and will serve generations to come. We need better recycling systems that effectively and efficiently sort, reuse, and recycle home and industrial waste. More importantly we need to start at the source of production. We need standards on production that limit what materials are made available for public consumption and disposal. Regulating the production of these unnecessary consumer products that produce large quantities of landfill fodder will eliminate the need for expensive waste disposal systems all together. I applaud the city's passed the ban on plastic bags, as a step in the right direction. Instead of congratulating a company like Waste Management with the approval of yet another expansion, we should focus our energies on investing in alternative waste-cycling systems and our regulation of industrial production.

Chiquita Canyon is a beautiful place of historic significance. (see FEIR Chapter 9) During the forcedconversion to Catholicism by the Spanish, the Tataviam people selected a cave inside the canyon to store and protect a cache of objects sacred to their native religious practices. They selected this cave as a site of protection, safety, and sanctity. The collection found in the cave is believed to be the largest collection of native religious objects discovered in the United States. The cave now overlooks the catastrophic site of consumer-industrial waste mismanagement. Even though the Fernando Tatavium issued a letter of acceptance, the cultural heritgae of this site should be respected and unmaimed by further exploitive and unecological development. I would like to bring this part of the FEIR to attention.

I'm deeply impressed by the community of Val Verde's mobilization and commitment to protecting their families, their health, and our shared environment. This is a social justice issue - after reviewing

the chapter in the FEIR, which narrowly depicts the population's demographics against Los Angeles' demographics, I became away of the misrepresentation of the Val Verde as a 'not particularly diverse' area. The comparison between minorities in Val Verde with the minorities in the city of Los Angeles is an bogus analysis that unfairly serves the project as a foil. If one instead makes the analysis between Val Verde and the city of Santa Clarita, one will find an undue compromise of minority and low income populations true to the regional makeup.

Please include this demographic report to the one's previously listed in the FEIR:

## Santa Clarita

Racial Makeup: White Non-Hispanic: 69% Hispanic: 21% Other: 9% Two or More Races: 4% Black: 2% Filipino: 2% America Indian: 1.3% Japanes, Chinese, Korean & Other Asian: 3.1% (Total is more than 100% because Hispanics may be counted more than once / in other races)

## Income:

Median Household Income: \$80,000/yr. Per Capita Income: \$31,500/yr. Cost of Living Index: 135 (35% above average)

-From: https://www.santaclarita.com/demographics/

Thank you for your attention to this letter. I trust that it will serve the deliberation about this project justly.

Sincerely,

Susanna Battin

620 Park Row Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90012 213 858 7077

\*Particles in the PM<sub>25</sub> size range are able to travel deeply into the respiratory tract, reaching the lungs. Exposure to fine particles can cause short-term health effects such as eye, nose, throat and lung irritation, coughing, sneezing, runny nose and shortness of breath. Exposure to fine particles can also affect lung function and worsen medical conditions such as asthma and heart disease. Scientific studies have linked increases in daily PM<sub>25</sub> exposure with increased respiratory and cardiovascular hospital admissions, emergency department visits and deaths. Studies also suggest that long term exposure to fine particulate matter may be associated with increased rates of chronic bronchitis, reduced lung function and increased mortality from lung cancer and heart disease. People with breathing and heart problems, children and the elderly may be particularly sensitive to PM<sub>25</sub>.

Susanna Battin

--

<u>susbatt.com</u> sbattin@fastmail.fm

From: Sent: To: Subject: isaacinla@gmail.com on behalf of Isaac Lieberman <ILieberm@ucla.edu> Wednesday, March 01, 2017 3:36 PM Isaac Lieberman RN I oppose the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion!

I oppose the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion! Close it down, NOW!

Isaac Lieberman, RN Cell: (661) 373-6084

E-Mail: ILieberm@UCLA.edu Connect on... Facebook: <u>http://www.facebook.com/Isaac.Lieberman</u> LinkedIn: <u>http://linkedin.com/in/IsaacLieberman</u> Twitter: <u>http://twitter.com/isaacInLA</u>

From: Sent: To: Subject: Ken <uurev@aol.com> Wednesday, March 01, 2017 3:50 PM Richard Claghorn Landfill

Dear Mr. Claghorn,

I am writing about my concern about the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Three generations of my family live in Santa Clarita, my grandchildren go to one of the schools near the landfill, I hope you take seriously the following concerns.

It was promised that this landfill would be closed when it reached the agreed upon limit in June 2016, but it is trying to get another extension that would double its current intake from 6,000 tons to 12,000 tons, increase the elevation to 133 feet and expand its footprint on the property the company owns. But of greater concern is that this landfill is located near the Val Verde housing development whose population is primarily people of color. Once again we see that people of color are bearing the burden of our lack of environmental policy that protects people from gases and pollution caused by this landfill. Further, it is 2.5 miles from three schools with over 5,000 students who will be negatively impacted by keeping this landfill open.

I understand that the county has other options for landfill use, I hope that you will take my concerns seriously and shut down this particular site that has exceeded its agreed upon limits.

1

Sincerely Yours,

Rev. Dr. Ken Brown Santa Clarita, CA <u>uurev@aol.com</u> 818-370-2390

From: Sent: To: Subject: Alicia Eastman <aliciaeastman@icloud.com> Wednesday, March 01, 2017 5:39 PM Richard Claghorn Chiquita Landfill

Dear Mr. Laghorn,

I'm writing to let you know that I oppose the Chiquita Landfill project.

This will affect the health of our children and the quality of life for the community. Our property values will decline and it will hurt businesses. People and businesses will move out of our community.

1

Thank you.

Alicia Eastman

Sent from my iPhone

| From:    | Theresa Brady <terriebrady@gmail.com></terriebrady@gmail.com> |
|----------|---|
| Sent:    | Wednesday, March 01, 2017 9:51 PM                             |
| То:      | Richard Claghorn  |
| Cc:      | sheila@bos.lacounty.gov                                       |
| Subject: | i oppose the expansion and operation of the chiquita landfill |

Please keep your promise to the residents of Val Verde and close the chiquita landfill. The particulate matter that the residents have been exposed to during the 20 years of its operation should stop. the health of the elderly and the young are at stake.

1

| From:        | lynnepl1@juno.com                                  |
|--------------|--|
| Sent:        | Thursday, March 02, 2017 1:19 AM                   |
| То:          | madroneweb@aol.com                                 |
| Cc:          | Richard Claghorn                                   |
| Subject:     | Re: when do you think that the hearing will end?   |
| Attachments: | CHIQUITA TALKING POINTS FOR MAR 1 HEARINGSW1A.docx |

Oh sorry - I didn't see this. It went until 9:30. BUT they couldn't get through all the speakers, so it is continued to April 19th. downtown - maybe easier for you.

And Of course, you can also send claghorn ("Richard Claghorn"<rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov>), and your supervisor a letter via email.

AND thank, thank you for even thinking of attending. It is SUCH a trip for you. Very wonderful. I attached some talking points in case you want to send a letter. Lynne

------ Original Message ------From: "Bruce Campbell" <madroneweb@aol.com> To: <lynnepl1@juno.com> Subject: when do you think that the hearing will end? Date: Wed, 1 Mar 2017 18:56:16 -0800

Hi Lynne,

It's a bit before 7 PM and I'm at home on the Westside.

I could possibly make it up to the hearing – maybe around 8 PM or so – IF you RSVP soon and advise that the hearing will likely continue til at least 8:30 PM.

Let me know. Thanks, Bruce
## CHIQUITA LANDFILL EXPANSION TALKING POINTS

- Chiquita Canyon Landfill currently sits less than 1,000 feet from nearby residents in Val Verde
- It is the destination for waste from municipalities throughout all of Southern California
- Expansion would make this the largest landfill in California
- It would accept more trash than the largest in the U.S.
- Resulting greenhouse gas emissions would exceed the "significance threshold" with operational activities that "may result in a potentially significant impact on the environment" (EIR)
- Is partially unlined, (though all liners leak) and may be causing water pollution to the Santa Clara River. Better water quality monitoring should be required
- Is located just south of an active fault line.
- It sits atop our valley's groundwater aquifer where no soil testing has been done.
- Landslides have already occurred in the landfill and increased truck traffic may cause further landslides in the canyon
- The South Coast Air Quality Management District cited the lack of critical analysis and acknowledged potential significant impacts to air quality ground water and safety for our community in response to the original draft EIR
- Meanwhile, the Mesquite Regional Landfill in Imperial County, built to a permitted limit of approximately 600 million tons of solid waste and 100 years of operation, is not being used.
- The environmental impact report says that several air pollutants will remain significant even after mitigation, including dust particle (PM2.5). These particles lodge in the lungs, causing asthma and other severe respiratory problems. They are especially harmful to children.
- In 1997. The community of Val Verde agreed not to pursue litigation against the landfill in exchange for it being closed after it reached 23 million tons or Nov. 2019 whichever was sooner. It reached 23 million tons in June 2016, but was not closed. Promises should be kept.
- In the 1997 conditions of approval, condition 46 said that the landfill shall be closed when it reached 23million tons. It reached 23 million tons in June 2016, but was not closed. Promises should be kept. How can we trust the County to follow the conditions they set out after this failure?

(As expressed in Kathy Pisaro's Excellent Signal Column 2-23-170

## MORE CHIQUITA LANDFILL TALKING POINTS

• The impact on our quality of life as we would experience it, right here in the Santa Clarita Valley, should this extension be approved, is monumental.

- Do you really want trash from San Diego, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura, Orange, and Los Angeles Counties to be trucked all the way north to the Chiquita Canyon Landfill?
- Some of this trash comes from as far as just north of Tijuana.
- An expansion of Chiquita would more than double the number of trucks headed to the landfill every day, thus adding significantly to the already poor quality of air that prevails here on many days.
- Think for a moment about the many ADDITIONAL truck accidents that would occur almost daily. The I-5 freeway is already over capacity.
- There is an alternative, sitting idly by, awaiting the parade, not of trucks, but of rail cars a very efficient and far less polluting method of removing trash, out of our sight, to Mesquite, a location far from homes.
- We must not allow the expansion of this landfill to negatively affect our children's health, our quality of life, our property values, and much, much more!

# ADDITIONAL CHIQUITA POINTS PUTTING PROFITS BEFORE PEOPLE

- Residents of Val Verde have, for many years, been exposed to frequent reeking odors. There are days when residents find it necessary to stay inside.
- Health issues have increased, particularly asthma, respiratory problems and cancer.
- 2 local schools are within 1 mile of the landfill; others are within a 2  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile distance
- The landfill's agreed upon capacity has exceeded its 23 million ton limit. Parties to the agreement should be required to honor it!
- More than doubling the truck traffic six days each week will increase valley-wide pollution and freeway congestion
- Pollution affects the entire valley
- Quality of life, including property values will be detrimentally affected!
- Not only does the landfill stand to make a huge profit, but The County of Los Angeles receives "tipping fees" of approximately \$770,000 per month. They must not put constituents at risk to favor their budget.
- WE DO NOT WANT TO BECOME KNOWN AS THE VALLEY OF THE DUMPS FOR ALL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA!

| From:    | Logan Smith <agfstudios@yahoo.com></agfstudios@yahoo.com>               |
|----------|---|
| Sent:    | Thursday, March 02, 2017 10:00 AM                                       |
| То:      | Richard Claghorn; Rosie Ruiz  |
| Subject: | Fw: The Signal LTE: Logan Smith: An open letter to Santa Clarita Valley |

Mr/s Claghorn and Ruiz,

My name is Logan Smith, I presented a public comment at last night's hearing on item 5, the proposed expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Thank you for your time and attention regarding this critical subject.

As several speakers in favor of the landfill cited their positions on the Val Verde Citizen Advisory Committee in their testimony, I feel it is necessary to share an anecdote with you. Last year, I reached out to Rosalind Wayman regarding appointment to a vacant at-large position on the committee. It took Barger several months to approach me for a position. When this conversation was happening, the Santa Clarita Valley Signal published a letter-to-the-editor I wrote in opposition to the landfill. Attached is an email sent to Dr Faye Snyder by Wayman, in response to my LTE. Wayman forwarded a "high importance" email circulated by a number of county employees, highlighting a particular line in my LTE in red.

Wayman's comment in response to my LTE:

"I won't be contacting Mr. Smith."

Wayman intentionally excluded voices critical of the landfill from participation in the advisory committee. I believe this is worth noting in your review of this matter.

Thank you,

Logan Smith (661) 644-2512

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Wayman, Rosalind" <<u>RWayman@bos.lacounty.gov</u>>

Subject: FW: The Signal LTE: Logan Smith: An open letter to Santa Clarita Valley

Date: December 21, 2016 at 8:43:46 AM PST

To: DR S FAYE SNYDER Snyder < drfaye1@me.com>

I won't be contacting Mr. Smith.

Rosalind Wayman

Santa Clarita Valley Senior Deputy 27441 Tourney Road, Suite 180 Valencia, CA 91355 Office: (661) 287-3657 rwayman@bos.lacounty.gov

<image001.jpg> <image002.png><image004.png><image005.png>

From: Jace, Jo-Anne
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2016 8:29 AM
To: Wayman, Rosalind; Bell, Tony; Vizcarra, Edel; Leaf, Fred
Cc: Rankin, Cameron
Subject: The Signal LTE: Logan Smith: An open letter to Santa Clarita Valley
Importance: High

<image003.png>

http://secure-web.cisco.com/1iAlv7\_OByZEUyDJSZvtZkYgFZAHTDVy9Ufb2CDp3UG6p9i9q0z4on-2E0aiOpjjtFoOhD0ReqeG07v3pZMZXIInnc1b9pF--c7TvJiPrQfefSazM15Q3bntmQ-Z0jFxBSrHvdp7psa1r3yAO0il2VFZybAkL7QNA61m3IS-I6UMb8oimGb3OuQWYWwyp4i\_v7p6lgkO4aaKDQasRczZYEUeUQq4Idmf3kGtzCY-nokGHbeEJE-W4ZxYiAMkqNaQx0Bs8QX5TYLY0IDV1nwXsa4IEhQqNP0fTVJcGJylvh7kVNlamhbnkT4ynVdO-8tCdx4qu09mNwXZzRNqrh8BJ1TBOT971wab3r7aByY2xLYQskCEUExuHRfRBWiZA9oefmR4sfwezN8D1CV Nzj7L7g/http%3A%2F%2Fwww.signalscv.com%2F2016%2F12%2F20%2Flogan-smith-open-letter-santaclarita-valley%2F

## Logan Smith: An open letter to Santa Clarita Valley

Logan Smith, Valencia

By <u>Signal Contributor</u> December 21, 2016

A little less than a month ago, I flew to North Dakota to stand with Standing Rock against the Dakota Access Pipeline. On Dec. 4, the Army Corp of Engineers denied the easement necessary for Energy Transfer Partners to drill under the Oahe reservoir and complete the pipeline.

This decision represents a significant victory for the Standing Rock Sioux tribe, their thousands of allies camped in North Dakota, and the millions of people who stood up across the United States and around the world on behalf of environmental justice and indigenous rights.

I returned home from Oceti Sakowin not to rest, but to fight. Now our community must stand and demand justice here at home.

The Chiquita Canyon Landfill, operated by Waste Connections Inc., is operating in violation of the conditional use permit issued in 1997 after significant resistance from the residents of Val Verde.

The landfill poses environmental and health risks to adjacent communities, including but not limited to significant and unavoidable deterioration of air quality and increased greenhouse gas emissions.

Despite exceeding the tonnage limit defined in the 1997 conditional use permit, Waste Connections now seeks to significantly expand the Chiquita Canyon site, presenting an even greater threat to residents, workers, and school children in Val Verde, Live Oak, Castaic and even Valencia.

Our community must come together to loudly and clearly demand that Chiquita Canyon ceases operations in agreement with the 1997 permit.

Waste Connections argues the cancer risk posed by the landfill is "less than significant." I say that if a single person develops cancer attributable to carcinogenic substances being dumped at Chiquita, it is very much significant.

The health of our community is at stake. Los Angeles County and Supervisor Kathryn Barger have a moral obligation to protect citizens from predatory business.

Waste Connections doesn't need the county's help finding loopholes and legal tricks; it has plenty of its own lawyers to do that. But the people of Val Verde and Live Oak do not.

I ask everyone to stand with me now in the name of justice for our community. We must oppose the expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill and demand that Waste Connections comply with the original conditional use permit.

We stopped digital billboards. We'll stop Cemex. Let's stop this landfill's illegal expansion.

| From:        | Stacy Fortner <s fortner@yahoo.com=""></s>  |
|--------------|---|
| Sent:        | Thursday, March 02, 2017 10:35 AM   |
| To:          | Richard Claghorn; Rosie Ruiz  |
| Cc:          | kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; Robert Glaser; executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov                                       |
| Subject:     | Chiquita Canyon Dump Hearing  |
| Attachments: | Deleted from Chiquita page.PNG; deleted post.PNG; Adventure Paly.PNG; Adventure Play3.PNG; My Facebook post.PNG |

#### Good Morning,

My name is Stacy Fortner, and I am a 19 yr resident of Santa Clarita. I spoke in opposition of the dump expansion last evening and thought I would share some recent events that occurred in Santa Clarita around this topic.

As you know, John Musella is the Public Relations partner that represents Chiquita Canyon dump, and has for many years. Recently as a family was at one of the local parks Mr. Musella lurked in bushes, behind trees, and around corners taking photos of these people (unknowingly to them) and then used those photos in a positive ad campaign on social media without permission, and with very nefarious purposes. Mr Musella was asked repeatedly to remove those photos from the Chiquita dump Facebook page to which he refused. Mr Musella then started systematically deleting any comments on the Chiquita dump facebook pages that had any hint of disapproval, or opposition leaving the page a stunning one sided slap in the face of the community.

My personal comments were deleted and I was then banned from future comments on the page. I approached Mr. Musella at the tour yesterday, and asked why my comments were deleted and I was blocked. He stated to me that he blocks anyone in opposition because he can't show those comments while the dump is expanding, therefore deceiving the community and the public that venture to the page for information.

I beg to you to please see through this smoke screen to see this for what it really is - A SLAP DOWN to the underprivileged, under served, and disenfranchised population of Val Verde. Please oppose the Expansion.

Blessings, Stacy Fortner

P.S. Flo Lawrence is the liar in the front row of that photo. He lied under oath and when we showed him how we know, he got up and left. Are there penalties for lying under oath at a county hearing?

| <ul> <li>Chiquita Canyon Chiquita Canyon is the largest Clean Energy generator in the Santa Clarita Valley.</li> <li>I - February 25 at 5:09pm</li> <li>Marleny Padilla ???? Who's Homes. Where?</li> <li>February 25 at 10:09pm</li> <li>Chiquita Canyon The clean energy goes onto the power grid in</li> </ul> | 21 shares Chronological * | A Share | Studio Signal - Chiquita Canyon<br>Waste to Energy<br>Chiquita Canyon Landfill located in Castaic,<br>produces enough clean energy to power 10,000 | Your waste becomes green energy at Chiquita Canyon powering 10,000 homes each year. |
|---|---------------------------|---------|--|---|
|---|---------------------------|---------|--|---|

| Santa Clarita Co<br>Public Group | Unitratulaty                                  | Joined ▼   |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Discussion Members               | Events Videos Photos Files                    | Search this group                                |
| Admin Activity                   | Pending Posts                                 |  |
| Pending Posts                    |   |  |
| Member Requests 20+              | R Todd Preisendorf<br>Just now                | <<br>×   |
| Reported to Admin                | Swamp draining begins! The left side looks to | to be Anti-America, can't applause anything that |
| Reported to Facebook             | Like A Share                                  |  |
| Kequest Nouncations              |   |  |



Chiquita Canyon added 3 new photos. February 18 at 10:05am · 🚱

Our cool neighbors, SCV Adventure Play and Erica Larson, organized so many children and families to enjoy the outdoors in Val Verde right by Chiquita Canyon!





# PLAYWORK CAMPFERENCE

We are extremely pleased to be working with Santa Clarita Valley Adventure Play to bring to you the first ever Playwork Campference. During 16th to 19th February 2017, we will be gathering together in Val Verde CA, USA to celebrate playwork in the surroundings of the hatchling site, Eureka Villa Adventure Playground. The Playwork Campference 2017 will have the following focuses: Playwork Practice – specifically learning how to embed playwork into both... Read More

À Share

22

Chronological \*

## 2 shares



Tamara Battles Monroe I walked by this yesterday and it looked like it was going to be a lot of fun. But oh the rain!!!!

4 · February 17 at 8:48am



Chiquita Canyon Great to have so many children and families enjoying the outdoors in Val Verde right by Chiquita Canyon! Hats off to Erica Larson on bringing people in for a wonderful experience!

1 - February 18 at 1:52pm - Edited



Stacy Fortner 27 mins - 🕲 🛪

Speaking at the Chiquita hearing last night solidified one thing for me...

Every single person that spoke in favor has a monetary connection be it wages, donations, scholarships, sponsorship, charitable giving, and the list goes on.

It leaves me to wonder if the money goes away, will the cheer leading also stop? I mentioned in my comments what a cheap date Santa Clarita is to a billion dollar company. Selling ourselves short and getting all googly eyed over 70 bikes & a couple of thousand dollars here and there. I wonder if I started a bike drive, how many this COMMUNITY could come up with. Just a random thought this morning...

P.S. The man in the bright green shirt in the very front of this photo LIED under oath, which speaks VOLUMES about the integrity of this entire expansion process. I hope that people see that.

#IntegrityMatters #LiesLiesandMoreLies #LiedUnderoath



From: Sent: To: Subject: DRP LDCC Thursday, March 02, 2017 1:01 PM Samuel Dea; Richard Claghorn FW: Oppose the Landfill!

Another email on this

Thank you,

Alice Wong, AICP Principal Planner Land Development Coordinating Center Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1360 Los Angeles, CA 90012 http://planning.lacounty.gov/

Department Front Counter Hours: M, Tu, Th 7:30am-5:30pm & W 8:30am-5:30pm Closed every Friday

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, attorney work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender of this email immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and immediately destroy this message, including any attachments.

-----Original Message-----From: Bevin Gur [mailto:bevingur@gmail.com] Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 1:00 PM To: fifthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Sheila@bos.lacounty.gov; MarkRidleythomas@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; claghorn@planning.lacounty.gov; executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov; DRP LDCC <D4@planning.lacounty.gov>; Robert Glaser <rglaser@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: Oppose the Landfill!

Please oppose the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion.

The landfill has been an inconsiderate smelly neighbor to the residents of Val Verde and Castaic for too long. While Waste Connections makes money from operating the landfill to create positive sounding advertisements and give donations to keep negative press and Santa Clarita Republican leaders from speaking out against the landfill, it leaves the limited power, time, money and other resources of individual home owners to carry the burden of resisting this expansion.

Although no further expansion permits should be allowed at Chiquita, the landfill will still exist. So I believe it is probably a good idea for Waste Connections to be allowed to continue to use the methane gas generated by its Chiquita dump to produce electricity (Ref: SCV Republican call to action letter in late February explaining that it powers 10,000

homes.) Burning off the gas is a poor alternate solution. It is also a good idea to allow Waste Connections to build the waste-to-energy plant, providing they can only use the waste they have already collected.

We do not want more trucks bringing trash from other cities into our community. The fumes generated by those trucks is yet another impact of the dump on the air quality within the Santa Clarita Valley. Please do not put our air and water supply at further risk. Our environment is worth so much more than money can buy.

.

Sincerely, Bevin Gür

Rudy J. Ortega, Jr. Tribal President



Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians Tribal Historic & Cultural Preservation

Tribal Historic & Cultural Preservation Committee Steve Ortega Chairman

Sent via e-mail: Richard Claghorn (rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov)

Sent via mail to:

Richard Claghorn Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

March 1 2017

#### RE: Formal Comments Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, subdivision (b), (d) and (e) on the Final Environmental Impact Report (ENV-200400039) for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Project (CCLP) (Proposed Project)

The Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (the Tribe) thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the Final Environmental Impact Report (ENV-200400039) for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Project (CCLP). As expressed in our letter of April 12 2014, the Tribe entered into an agreement with Chiquita Canyon, LLC (CCL) on the matter of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Project (CCLP). The Tribe is providing CCL with construction monitoring and cultural resource oversight services for the CCLP.

The Tribe feels strongly that mitigation measure CR-3 as stipulated in *Chapter 9- Cultural and Paleontological Resources* adequately ensures the Tribe's involvement in the protection of tribal cultural resources. We also agree with "9.9.2.1 Cultural Resources" of the FEIR, which stipulates that the implementation of mitigation measures CR-1 and CR-3 would address both potential Proposed Project impacts to cultural resources, as well as potential cumulative impacts. In addition, we support mitigation measure BR-15, which requires CCL to coordinate with the Tribe to provide a monitor during the removal or disturbance of native oak trees at CCL, if desired by the Tribe.

The Tribe has not only identified the potential for cultural resources within the CCLP proposed grading and excavation, but also protected and preserved known significant cultural sites within the Project's area of effect. As the Tribe tied ancestrally and historically to the Project property, we are confident that the FEIR adequately protects our cultural spaces and materials, and ensures appropriate measures of preservation.

Sincerely <del>Ay Ortega</del> Ir **Tribal** President

1019 Second Street, Suite 1 | San Fernando | California, 91340 | (818) 837-0794 | Fax (818) 837-0796 | thep@tataviam-nsn.us

From:Kimia Fatehi <kfatehi@tataviam-nsn.us>Sent:Thursday, March 02, 2017 1:24 PMTo:Richard ClaghornCc:Rudy OrtegaSubject:Fernandeño Tataviam Comments: FEIR (ENV-200400039) Chiquita Canyon Landfill ProjectAttachments:FTB Comments\_Chiquita\_3\_1\_2017.pdf

#### Greetings,

Thank you for your notification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Project (Project). Attached is a letter with comments by the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (Tribe) on the Project's FEIR. A copy was also provided at the public hearing yesterday, March 1 2017. Please let me know if there is anything else I may provide.

Sincerely,

Kimia

Kimia Fatehi **Director, Public Relations** Officer, Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians 1019 Second Street, Suite 1 San Fernando, California 91340 Mobile: (949) 235-2838 Office: (818) 837-0794 Website: http://secureweb.cisco.com/1wBcY5GIfXPQaxupak7VpJPJybod1rzMfZQGS\_ekcoLNf8ZyXa2i4uX7xHMz83QU4Yjizps5Qyr\_OWiOQE VUd9pNCTrM WFhE4k9w5kb1hNfWU0cXPeJ1CwrITANEdU263kaJLRNg4SrharQfH9LS629FPmuKPvwkNaR 0vkhED gbr7cK5gNWQ1M0HeGOJ6eTVV79UJLLV8nCOYSLp5qZlbszHuYR4oMKhn8rlFmYXROHLryDqOcvatk9mWp57YTKp21qX4QAPFcVjYY1Qa1vybis7 XIC12rTHw5-dp4SxqWN8DCsk4a2ca3DgdsIm9PEvaP8A-VoR 7r GAv33Y064uk g CCp7n58tnFaEFev6n58MgcbvxXfAAV2H4zSszzfef-ZF2w828lt0kJllQ/http%3A%2F%2Fwww.tataviam-nsn.us

From: Sent: To: Subject: Nell Campbell <nellcampbell.ca@gmail.com> Thursday, March 02, 2017 11:26 PM Richard Claghorn March 1st, 2017: Chiquita Canyon Hearing

dear Mr. Claghorn,

There was insufficient time for me to make my below comments at Wednesday night's meeting and I would respectfully request that these are added to the body of material under consideration in this matter.

Any landfill is a future hazard. Once toxins are put in the ground they will inevitably leach through into groundwater and the food chain – it is just a question of how long it will take.

People put bad things in the trash, and some of those DO get into the ground. It takes 450 years for a disposable diaper to decompose, and for household batteries - look at a half-life of up to 1100 years for cadmium, and 53,000 years for lead.

The toxic soup of chemicals and heavy metals that WILL end up in the water table cause cancer, birth defects, low birth weight and genetic mutations, lung damage, asthma, liver damage, ear nose & throat issues – the list is endless.

The safety liner system installed at Chiquita Canyon may last "up to 100 years" (according to District Manager, Steve Cassulo) but when it finally fails there is no "Plan B". Toxic Organic Micro Pollutants cannot be removed from the soil once they have been buried.

I attended the Landfill Tour this afternoon, where an "us" and "them" atmosphere prevailed. We were bused to two locations but kept far away from the working face - despite our requests to go there - and on the up-wind side of the facility. On site, the District Manager, Steve Cassulo, told me he has "no idea" what is already buried in the areas of the existing site that were dug in the 1970's, which was "before his watch". Local stories that the integrity of the original 1970's liner(s) are defective are most disturbing, and these should be investigated and verified in a transparent public forum. Landslides and earthquakes add to the future threat of liners rupturing.

It is pointless to take the best care of ourselves and our kids' health, staying fit, eating organic food and so forth, if the air we breathe and the water we drink, bathe and recreate in has been poisoned. The **pursuit of Corporate Profit over the well-being** of Individuals and Families is immoral.

If the past promises to close this Landfill are not kept and the expansion is approved, Los Angeles County will have failed in its duty to protect the residents of this area and be culpable for the resulting sickness, deaths, and financial detriment their decision causes.

The County should also wish "good luck" to any future inhabitants of the area, especially the thousands of potential residents of the proposed Newhall Ranch Development, currently under consideration.

I strongly urge the County to deny this flawed, badly researched and short-sighted petition, to honor the past agreement to close the Chiquita Landfill, and to transport waste by rail [thus greatly mitigating the traffic issues of the current arrangement] to the Mesquite Regional Landfill facility in line with the 20 year old plan.

I am grateful for your time and attention.

Yours sincerely,

Nell Campbell 28126 Bryce Drive, Castaic, CA 91384

[970] 389-1237

| From:    | Rick Kamlet <rkamlet@ca.rr.com></rkamlet@ca.rr.com>    |
|----------|--|
| Sent:    | Friday, March 03, 2017 9:16 AM                         |
| То:      | DRP LDCC; Richard Claghorn; Robert Glaser; Oscar Gomez |
| Cc:      | executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov                       |
| Subject: | Comments about Chiquita Landfill                       |

Dear LA County Department of Regional Planning,

I was unable to make it to the hearing the other evening, but I wanted to express being against the expansion of the Chiquita Landfill.

IT WAS PROMISED:

- In 1997, the community of Val Verde agreed not to pursue litigation against the landfill in exchange for it being closed after it reached 23 million tons or Nov. 2019 whichever was sooner. It reached 23 million tons in June 2016, but was not closed. Promises should be kept.
- In the 1997 conditions of approval, condition 46 said that the landfill shall be closed when it reached 23 million tons. It reached 23 million tons in June 2016, but was not closed. Promises should be kept. How can we trust the County to follow the conditions they set out after this failure?

AIR POLUTION AND ROAD CONGESTION FROM TRUCKS:

- I've heard that expansion of Chiquita would more than double the number of trash trucks headed to the landfill every day. I'm not sure if that's compared to today or compared to the condition of closing the landfill. In either case, it would add significantly to the already poor quality of air that prevails here in Santa Clarita on many days. Santa Clarita is a catch basic for air pollution. We need to be working to lower it, not increase it! This will also increase the traffic in an area that is already overloaded (compared to the condition of closing the landfill). That is an worthy goal.
- Think for a moment about the many ADDITIONAL truck accidents that would occur almost daily. The I-5 freeway is already over capacity.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Chiquita Canyon Landfill currently sits less than 1,000 feet from nearby residents in Val Verde
- Resulting greenhouse gas emissions would exceed the "significance threshold" with operational activities that "may result in a potentially significant impact on the environment" (EIR)
- Is partially unlined and may be causing water pollution to the Santa Clara River. Better water quality monitoring should be required.
- Is located just south of an active fault line.
- It sits atop our valley's groundwater aquifer where no soil testing has been done.
- Landslides have already occurred in the landfill and increased truck traffic may cause further landslides in the canyon
- The South Coast Air Quality Management District cited the lack of critical analysis and acknowledged potential significant impacts to air quality ground water and safety for our community in response to the original draft EIR
- The environmental impact report says that several air pollutants will remain significant even after mitigation.
   These particles lodge in the lungs, causing asthma and other severe respiratory problems. They are especially harmful to children.

#### NOT JUST LOCAL TRASH:

- It is the destination for waste from municipalities throughout all of Southern California
- We've heard that of this trash comes from as far as just north of Tijuana. Is that true? That should not be hauled up to Santa Clarita.
- Do we really want trash from San Diego, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura, Orange, and Los Angeles Counties to be trucked all the way north to the Chiquita Canyon Landfill? I say, no!

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

- Meanwhile, the Mesquite Regional Landfill in Imperial County, built to a permitted limit of approximately 600 million tons of solid waste and 100 years of operation, is not being used.
- This alternative, sitting idly by, awaiting the parade, not of trucks, but of rail cars a very efficient and far less polluting method of removing trash, out of our sight, to Mesquite, a location far from homes.

#### QUALITY OF LIFE:

- The impact on our quality of life as we would experience it, right here in the Santa Clarita Valley, should this extension be approved, is monumental. We must not allow the expansion of this landfill to negatively affect our children's health, our quality of life, our property values, and much, much more!
- Residents of Val Verde have, for many years, been exposed to frequent reeking odors. There are days when residents find it necessary to stay inside.
- Health issues have increased, particularly asthma, respiratory problems and cancer.
- Two local schools are within 1 mile of the landfill; others are within a 2 ½ mile distance .
- Odors and pollution would gradually overtake the entire valley.
- Quality of life, including property values will be detrimentally affected!

•

#### UNFAIR TO US:

- Not only does the landfill stand to make a huge profit, but The County of Los Angeles receives "tipping fees" of approximately \$770,000 per month. They must not put constituents at risk to favor their budget. Expansion would make this the largest landfill in California
- It would accept more trash than the largest in the U.S.
- We do not want Santa Clarita to become the "Valley of the Dumps" for all of Southern California. Or all the negative impacts (above). We are a family community. There's an alternative that's not located in such a community. We've done our share.

Are any of these points wrong??

Richard Kamlet 25433 Via Nautica Valencia, CA 91355 rkamlet@ca.rr.com

From: Sent: To: Subject: joline Kelley <jolinek72@gmail.com> Friday, March 03, 2017 12:39 PM Richard Claghorn Re: Public Hearing and FEIR Notice for Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Hope you take the time to read this!

I attended the March 1st meeting regarding the expansion of the Chiquita Landfill. I got there around 5:45 and requested I have a chance to speak. Unfortunately, due to a 15 min. talk by the Landfill mgr. and the speeches of several the of big Political Reps, the time slipped by and it was almost 8:00 when a break was taken before the the little people against could voice an opinion! Unfortunately, I had to leave a little after 8:00 and I understand many did not get to speak. Surprise! Surprise! I got the impression it was planned that way! <u>Sorry to see how it was handled!!</u> I am very much against the expansion as I had experience with Methane gas affecting people and housing in South Seattle due to leakage and smells!

2017-02-16 17:23 GMT-08:00 Richard Claghorn <relaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov>:

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") will conduct a public hearing to consider the project described below, including the FEIR. You will have an opportunity to testify, or you can submit written comments to the planner below or at the public hearing. If the final decision on this proposal is challenged in court, testimony may be limited to issues raised before or at the public hearing.

Hearing Date and Time: Wednesday, March 1, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

Hearing Location: Rancho Pico Junior High School, 26250 Valencia Blvd., Stevenson Ranch, CA 91381

Project & Permit(s): R2004-00559-(5), Conditional Use Permit 200400042, Oak Tree Permit 201500007, Final Environmental Impact Report (ENV 200400039)

Project Location: 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Castaic, CA 91384, in the Newhall Zoned District

CEQA Determination: As the lead agency, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the Commission will consider the certification of the Environmental Impact Report ("EIR"), which includes the Final EIR ("FEIR") and Draft EIR ("DEIR"). The Commission will also consider adoption of the County Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), the CEQA Findings of Fact, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Final EIR will be available by February 16, 2017 at the following link:

http://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/project\_no\_t2004\_00559\_5\_conditional\_use\_permit\_2004\_00042\_chiquita\_canyon /

The hearing package will be available at the same link.

#### **Project Description:**

The applicant, Chiquita Canyon Landfill, is requesting a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") to authorize the continued operation and expansion of an existing Class III Landfill and the removal of four oak trees within the A-2-2 (Heavy Agricultural, Two-Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) and A-2-5 (Heavy Agricultural, Five-Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) Zone. The Proposed Project includes the following elements: development of a new entrance and support facilities; better utilization of the landfill's potential disposal capacity through a lateral extension of the existing waste footprint from 257 acres to 400 acres and increased maximum elevation from 1,430 feet to 1,573 feet; increased daily disposal limits from 6,000 tons per day of waste to 12,000 tons per day; acceptance of all nonhazardous wastes permitted at a Class III solid waste disposal landfill, exclusive of sludge; continued operation of the landfill; new design features; environmental monitoring; development of a Household Hazardous Waste Facility (HHWF); mixed organics processing/composting operation; and set-aside of land for potential future conversion technology. In addition, the Proposed Project includes the relocation of a portion of Southerm California Edison's utility Line in order to accommodate landfill improvements. A CUP is required in the A-2 Zone for land reclamation projects, pursuant to Section 22.24.150 of the Los Angeles County Code. The property is located in the Newhall Zoned District and the Castaic Area Community Standards District.

For more information regarding this application, contact <u>Richard Claghorn</u>, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (DRP), 320 W. Temple St., Los Angeles, CA 90012. Telephone: (213) 974-6443, Fax: (213) 626-0434, E-mail: <u>rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov</u>. Case materials are available online at <u>http://planning.lacounty.gov/case</u> or at the Valencia Library (23743 Valencia Blvd., Santa Clarita, CA 91355) or Castaic Library (27971 Sloan Canyon Rd., Castaic, CA 91384). All correspondence received by DRP shall be considered a public record.

If you need reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids, contact the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator at (213) 974-6488 (Voice) or (213) 617-2292 (TDD) with at least 3 business days' notice. Si necesita más información por favor llame al (213) 974-6466.

Project Location and Hearing Location:



DEPARTAMENTO DE PLANIFICACIÓN REGIONAL DEL CONDADO DE LOS ANGELES

AVISO DE AUDIENCIA PÚBLICA Y CONSIDERACIÓN DEL INFORME FINAL DEL IMPACTO AMBIENTAL

La Comisión de Planificación Regional del Condado de Los Angeles (La Comisión) llevará a cabo una audiencia pública para estudiar el proyecto descrito abajo, incluyendo el FEIR. Tendrán la oportunidad de testificar, enviar sus comentarios por escrito al planificador indicado abajo o entregarlos durante la audiencia pública. Si la resolución final es desafiada en corte, el testimonio podría ser limitado a cuestiones planteadas anteriormente o durante la audiencia pública.

Fecha y Hora de la Audiencia: miércoles, 1º de marzo del 2017, a las 6 p.m.

Lugar de la audiencia: Rancho Pico Junior High School, 26250 Valencia Blvd., Stevenson Ranch, CA 91381.

Proyecto y Permiso(s): R2004-00559-(5), Permiso de Uso Condicional 200400042, Permiso del Árbol del Roble 201500007, Informe Final del Impacto Ambiental (FEIR) (ENV 200400039).

Ublcación del Proyecto: 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Castaic, CA 91384, en el Distrito Zonificado de Newhall.

Resolución CEQA: Como la agencia principal, y en conformidad con la Ley de Calidad Ambiental de California (CEQA), la Comisión considerará la certificación del Informe del Impacto Ambiental (EIR), que incluye el Informe Final del Impacto Ambiental (FEIR) y la Versión Preliminar del Informe del Impacto Ambiental (DEIR). La Comisión también considerará la adopción del Programa de Reportaje de la Supervisión de las Medidas de Mitigación (MMRP), la Determinación de los Hechos de CEQA y una Declaración de Consideraciones Predominantes.

El Informe Final del Impacto Ambiental (FEIR) estará disponible apartir del 16 de Febero del 2017 siguiendo este enlace: <u>http://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/project\_no\_r2004\_00559\_5\_conditional\_use\_permit\_2004\_00042\_chigulta\_canvon\_/</u> El paquete de la Audiencia también estará disponible allí.

#### Descripción del Proyecto:

El aplicante, Chiquita Canyon Landfill, solicita un Permiso de Uso Condicional ("CUP", por sus siglas en inglés) que autorice la continuación de operaciónes, la expansión de un Vertedero Clase III ya existente, y la eliminación de cuatro árboles de roble dentro de la Zona A-2-2 (Agricultura Intensa, con un área de lote requerida de mínimo dos acres) y la A-2-5 (Agricultura Intensa, con un área de lote requerida de mínimo cinco acres). El Proyecto Propuesto incluye los siguientes elementos: desarrollo de una nueva entrada y nuevas instalaciones de apoyo; mejor aprovechamiento de capacidad de disposición mediante una expansión lateral de la huella ecológica ya existente de 1,430 pies a 1,573 pies; incremento de los límites del volumen de disposición de 6,000 toneladas por día de desperdicios a 12,000 toneladas por día; aceptación de todos los residuos no peligrosos permitidos en un vertedero de residuos sólidos Clase III, excluyendo fangos residuales; operación continua del vertedero; nuevas características de diseño; monitoreo ambiental; desarrollo de una instalación para residuos domésticos peligrosos (HHWF, por sus siglas en inglés); procesamiento y/u operación de compostaje orgánicos mixtos; y apartado de tierra para una instalación potencial futura de tecnología de conversión. Además, el Proyecto Propuesto incluye la reubicación de una porción de la línea eléctrica de Southern California Edison, para poder adaptar las mejoras al vertedero. Se requiere un CUP en la Zona A-2 para proyectos de recuperación de tierras, de conformidad con la Sección 22.24.150 del Reglamento del Condado de Los Ángeles. La propiedad está ubicada en el Distrito Zonificado de Newhall y en el Distrito de Normas de la Comunidad del Área de Castaic.

Para mas información sobre esta solicitud, contacte a <u>Richard Claghorn</u>, Departamento de Planificación Regional del Condado de Los Angeles (DRP), 320 W. Temple St., Los Angeles, CA 90012. Teléfono: (213) 974-6443, Fax: (213) 626-0434, E-mail: <u>rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov</u>. Los materiales del caso están disponibles en <u>http://planning.lacounty.gov/case</u>, en la Biblioteca Valencia (23743 Valencia Blvd., Santa Clarita, CA 91355) y en la Biblioteca Castaic (27971 Sloan Canyon Rd., Castaic, CA 91384). Toda la correspondencia recibida por DRP será considerada como pública.

Si requiere modificaciones razonables o recursos para discapacitados, contacte el Coordinador de la Ley de Cludadanos Americanos con Discapacidades (ADA, por sus siglas en inglés) al (213) 974-6488 (voz) o al (213) 617-2292 (TDD) con al menos tres días hábiles de anticipación. Si necesita más información por favor llame al (213) 974-6466.

Ubicación del Proyecto y Lugar de la Audiencia



Principal Regional Planning Assistant

Zoning Permits North Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1348 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Phone: <u>213-974-6443</u>

From: Sent: To: Subject: DRP LDCC Monday, March 06, 2017 12:53 PM Richard Claghorn; Samuel Dea FW: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Another email

Thank you,

Alice Wong, AICP Principal Planner Land Development Coordinating Center Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1360 Los Angeles, CA 90012 http://planning.lacounty.gov/

Department Front Counter Hours: M, Tu, Th 7:30am-5:30pm & W 8:30am-5:30pm Closed every Friday



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, attorney work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender of this email immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and immediately destroy this message, including any attachments.

From: Keith Schmidt [mailto:kschmidt007@gmail.com] Sent: Monday, March 06, 2017 11:40 AM To: DRP LDCC <D4@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

I oppose the Chiquita Landfill Expansion.

Reference Project: #R2004-00559-(5) CUP #2004-00042

Keith Schmidt 25834 London Pl. Stevenson Ranch, CA 91381



January 17, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Dae:

As the manager of a small business, I'm writing you to voice my support of Chiquita Canyon and its proposed Master Plan Revision. The continued operation of Chiquita Canyon is vital to the business operations of my company.

My company has been in business for more than 40 years, as a recycling company, trucking company, demolition service and general industrial services. Chiquita Canyon offers my company the ability to serve the needs of our local community and operates in the best interest of small businesses – other landfills owned and operated by big business don't generally offer small, family-owned businesses the same opportunities to utilize their facilities at competitive rates.

The competitive rates offered by Chiquita Canyon help keep us in business. Without the ability to utilize Chiquita's facility, our hauling company would be out of business.

Chiquita Canyon has been providing an important service to the homes and businesses in the Santa Clarita Valley and the Los Angeles region for more than four decades. The proposed plans will go far toward ensuring that the landfill can continue to responsibly meet the solid waste needs of the region for another 20-40 years and continue to serve the small hauler businesses throughout the area.

The construction and operation needs of the expanded landfill will also result in additional local jobs, increased tax and fee revenues, and an increased Community Benefits Fund – things which will also benefit local businesses and the region at-large.

My company appreciates and benefits from the services that Chiquita Canyon provides, and we recognize it's important that the company's Master Plan be approved in order to better serve the needs of the region. Chiquita Canyon has been an important part of our business operations and we look forward to our continued partnership with the company.

Sincere

Saul Gracian General Manager Ecology Auto Parts

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District

> Safety-First It's better to lose one minute in life... than to lose life in a minute. Ecology Auto Parts Inc. 14150 Vine Place Centicos CA 90703 Phone (542) 404-8843 Fax (862) 404-9884



January 20, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Dae:

I'm writing on behalf of **Ecology Auto Parts Inc.** to voice our company's support of Chiquita Canyon Landfill's Master Plan Revisions, outlined in the Partial Recirculated DEIR. We have worked closely with Chiquita Canyon over the years, we transport by truck load municipal solid waste, machinery, concrete, green waste and other commodities. In our experience, Chiquita Canyon has operated in a responsible manner, and the company has demonstrated that it is committed to safely managing the solid waste disposal needs of the region.

While the company has provided an important service to the Santa Clarita Valley and the Los Angeles region for more than four decades, these improvements will help ensure the landfill can continue to meet the needs of the area. Additional plans for green waste processing and composting operations will further Chiquita's commitment to the environment and a sustainable future, adding to their existing 9.2 Mega Watt Clean Energy Facility.

In our experience, the company has been a responsible member of the business community and the larger community. We feel the Master Plan Revision as proposed will help Chiquita Canyon by increasing tonnage and capacity without visually impacting the neighboring area. In addition, there will be additional safety features for vehicles entering and existing the site.

The responsible management of solid waste is key to our growing region, and the expansion and increased disposal rate being proposed for Chiquita Canyon will address this issue for several decades. The Partial Recirculated DEIR document also highlights the fact that this expansion is designed to not cause significant impacts to the region from an environmental or visual standpoint, protecting the overall integrity of the area.

The construction and operation needs of the expanded landfill will also result in additional local jobs, increased tax and fee revenues, and an increased Community Benefits Fund. While an on-site Clean Energy Facility already provides power to nearly 10,000 homes in the area, plans for green waste processing and composting operations and a new household hazardous waste facility will address the evolving needs of the people and live and work in the area.

Chiquita Canyon has built a reputation for handling the area's solid waste needs in an environmentally conscientious manner, monitoring environmental and related impacts to ensure the Valley's natural resources are protected. The Partial Recirculated DEIR clearly outlines the less-than-significant impacts

#### Safety-First It's better to lose one minute in life... than to lose life in a minute.

Ecology Auto Parts Inc. 14150 Vine Place Cerritos CA 90703 Phone (562) 404-8663 Fax (562) 404-9584



of the landfill expansion and Master Plan revisions, and the company is accounting for all necessary mitigation to less impacts on the area.

Again, **Ecology Auto Parts Inc.** believes that Chiquita Canyon is a key resource in the region and plays an important role it is overall success. The Master Plan Revision as outlined in the Partial Recirculated DEIR, will better equip the landfill to continue that role as our regional needs increase and evolve.

Sincerely,

June Sulla

FRANCISCO GUROLLA Office Technician Ecology Auto Parts

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District

| From:    | Cher Gilmore <chergilmore@sbcglobal.net></chergilmore@sbcglobal.net> |
|----------|--|
| Sent:    | Wednesday, March 08, 2017 10:03 PM                                   |
| To:      | Richard Claghorn   |
| Subject: | Project #R2004-00559-(5); Conditional Use Permit #2004-00042         |

Subject: Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion – Project #R2004-00559-(5); Conditional Use Permit #2004-00042

#### Dear Mr. Claghorn:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill. There are MANY reasons why it should not be expanded, but the overarching one is that it is simply inappropriate for what would become the largest dump in the U.S. to be located in this growing, suburban community. It is as inappropriate as allowing the giant CEMEX mega-mine, which would be one of the largest aggregate mines in the country, to proceed here. The mine has been stopped because of public opposition for over 15 years and is still in litigation, and I feel certain that if the landfill is approved for expansion, it will find itself in the same position. As well it should.

Following are additional reasons the landfill should not be approved for expansion.

#### Groundwater impacts

The landfill is located above Santa Clarita Valley's groundwater aquifer, and is partially unlined. Even if it were completely lined, *all* liners leak. It may already be causing water pollution to the Santa Clara River. Furthermore, it's located just south of an active fault line, which makes the additional weight of the proposed fill extremely problematic. Imagine the ground collapsing under the landfill and its contents being dumped into the aquifer! That aquifer provides about half of our community's drinking water, and in a drought-prone area, every drop of fresh water is precious. The landfill should never have been located here in the first place; to expand it further would be completely irresponsible.

#### Health issues

The landfill is located less than 1,000 feet from homes in Val Verde, and two local schools are within 1 mile of it; others are within 2½ miles. The environmental impact report (EIR) states that several air pollutants generated by the landfill will remain significant even after mitigation, including dust particles (PM2.5). This particular pollutant is especially detrimental to children's lungs because the small dust particles lodge there, causing asthma and other serious respiratory diseases. Many Val Verde residents are already suffering from these health problems, and although no formal health studies have been conducted (to my knowledge) around Chiquita, European studies have found that people living near landfills are much more likely to suffer from respiratory problems and cancer than the general population. Would you want your family – especially your children – to spend their days and nights being continually exposed to what amounts to poisons? Many of these folks can't afford to move and live elsewhere.

#### Traffic and Air Quality issues

Traffic is already congested in this area – especially on I-5, which is the route most of the trucks headed for Chiquita use and which is over capacity now. If the expansion is allowed, truck traffic would more than double, adding significantly to the already poor air quality in the valley on many days. In addition, the winds in Santa Clarita are guaranteed to eventually spread the odors and pollution from the landfill all over the valley. They cannot be contained in and over the

landfill, and many residents are already complaining about having to stay indoors on some days to avoid the stench. The South Coast Air Quality Management District, for further confirmation, acknowledged potential significant impacts to air quality, ground water, and safety for our community in response to the original Draft EIR.

#### Broken Agreement/Social Injustice

In the 1997 conditions of approval, condition 46 said that the landfill shall be closed when it reaches 23 million tons or November 2019, whichever is sooner. It reached 23 million tons in June 2016, but was not closed. The County did not keep its agreement, and this is a social justice issue as well as a betrayal of trust. A large portion of the Val Verde residents are low income, many are Spanish-speaking, and most are unfamiliar with either their rights or how to navigate the bureaucracy and legal system in this country – even if they could afford it. Therefore, they have no effective voice because they don't know the mechanisms for expressing their views. It is up to you and all of us to see that they aren't abused – and doubling the size of the landfill already in their back yards, making them sicker, and worsening their quality of life would be absolutely abusive.

#### <u>A Better Alternative is Available</u>

Mesquite Regional Landfill, in Imperial County – with a permitted limit of approximately 600 million tons of solid waste and 100 years of operation – has rail service to it already built (paid for by us taxpayers) and is not being used. Why would that be? Would it have anything to do with the "tipping fees" of approximately \$770,000/month the County of Los Angeles receives from the landfill? If that is the reason, I – and I believe most good-hearted people – would say that to choose money over the health and well-being of the citizens you are responsible for is morally repugnant. You don't have to put yourself in that position – please don't!

I have heard people argue that it would be more expensive to take garbage to Mesquite, but no one has said *how much* more expensive per household. My guess is that the increase per household would be very small. And how much is it worth to protect precious lives from unnecessary sickness or even premature death? Surely if customers knew that by paying a tiny bit more for garbage collection they would be saving fellow human beings from suffering, they would gladly do so.

Please do not approve expansion of this landfill. Send the garbage to Mesquite.

Cher Gilmore 18911 Circle of Friends Newhall, CA 91321 661-251-1718

From: Sent: To: Subject: Richard Claghorn Monday, March 13, 2017 9:48 AM 'Laurel Taylor' RE: Chiquita Canyon expansion

Hello Ms. Taylor,

Thank you for sharing your thoughts and concerns on the landfill project. I'll address your questions and concerns below.

- 1. The reason there is a separate link on our website for the support letters is that those letters were received after the public hearing packages were prepared. The RPC package included all letters we had received up to the time it was posted around Feb. 16. Additional letters were included in a RPC Supplemental Package dated 2/23/17, which can be found under the link "Staff memo to the RPC dated February 23, 2017", which included both letters of support and opposition. The support letters included in the separate links were posted around the same time, but were included separately since the supplemental package had already been prepared by the time they were received. More letters were included in a RPC Supplemental package on March 1. All letters we received, both in support and opposition to the project, were posted on our website and are accessible from the project's page. It wasn't intentionally set up to make the support letters more prominent, but since the bulk of those came in separately, we had to create a separate link. We've receive additional letters since the March 1 hearing, both for and against, which will be included in a new package to be posted about 2 weeks before the continued hearing on April 19.
- 2. Our department is not in charge of deciding whether to approve the permit or not, nor is our department in charge of collecting the landfill fees or deciding what fees to charge. Our department will collect some fees if the landfill is approved, but those would be in drawdown accounts to cover the cost of enforcement of the permit conditions and mitigation measures pertaining to our department's requirements, but that is only a small share of the overall fees the landfill would need to pay if it gets approved. The bulk of the landfill's fees are collected by the Department of Public Works (DPW), and DPW determines what fees to assess, although these could be changed by the RPC. The Department of Regional Planning (DRP) makes recommendations to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC), but the RPC is not a part of the Department and is not obligated to follow DRP's recommendations. Whether the landfill is approved or not will not really impact DRP's budget, since the fees we might collect would only be to cover the costs of enforcement. The fees don't have any real impact on DRP's recommendation. The RPC's decision will be based on their independent judgment. The RPC's decision may be appealed to the LA County Board of Supervisors (BOS), who will have the final say in the decision if there is an appeal.
- 3. Notices have been sent to residents of the Val Verde community for two hearings related to the Draft EIR for the project, one held in July 2014 and one in December 2016. More notices were sent prior to the March 1, 2017 hearing. Signs have also been posted in Val Verde and on the project site. The Zoning Code only requires notices to be sent to property owners within a 500 foot radius, and our normal policy is to send notices to owners in a 1,000 foot radius in the 5<sup>th</sup> Supervisorial District. We followed the 1,000 foot ownership notification policy, but in addition we mailed notices to all addresses in Val Verde, including those more than 1,000 feet away, plus any other interested people who asked to be notified of any hearings for this project. Signs were posted in Val Verde to inform residents there of the hearing, even though this was not technically required. DRP has done all it can to inform residents of Val Verde about the hearings related to this project, including providing bilingual hearing notices in English and Spanish. To clarify, the applicant is requesting to increase the rate of waste received at the landfill from 6,000 tons per day to 12,000 tons per day, and additionally to maintain the current level of "beneficial use materials". Beneficial use materials include such materials as soil or rock used to build internal access roads, cover materials, and other such uses, and are not counted as waste disposal tonnage. The amount of beneficial use materials was not restricted under the old CUP, and the amount received has ranged widely from about 2,358 tons per day (tpd) in 2011 to 2,092 tpd in 2013 and 4,543 tpd in 2016. If the

1

applicant's request is granted, the landfill would be able to accept 60,000 tons per week of waste, or 3,120,000 tons per year, plus 910,416 tons per year of beneficial use materials, including compost, for a total of 4,030,416 tons of all materials. DRP is recommending that the project be approved with an annual cap of 2,100,000 tons of all materials, including 1.4 million tons of solid waste and 700,000 tons of beneficial use material. The 2.1 million cap is based on the amount of total materials received in the baseline year of 2011. It would essentially be a "business as usual" scenario in terms of truck trips, air quality impacts, etc., since impacts would not increase above the baseline levels, and would in fact be less than impacts that occurred in 2016. The new fees imposed in the new permit could also potentially lead to much lower amounts of materials than what is permitted, although it's not yet clear how much effect the fees will have on the landfill operations. The landfill operator thinks the new fees will substantially reduce the amount of material coming to the landfill, and does not want the new fees to be imposed. It will ultimately be up to the RPC, or the BOS if there is an appeal, to decide whether to approve it or not, and what tonnage limits, fees, and other conditions should apply.

- 4. DRP is concerned about the potential health impacts of the landfill to surrounding areas. That is one of the reasons DRP is recommending that the level of materials taken in by the landfill not increase above the 2011 baseline level. The air quality levels have been found to comply with the applicable air quality thresholds set by AQMD, even with the proposed increase. Air quality should not become any worse as a result of the project, since the amount of waste received will remain about the same, or possibly will decrease, if DRP's recommendation is followed.
- 5. I have been out to the Val Verde community a few times. I appreciate the offer to visit, but I probably will not make another visit before the April 19 hearing. Again, DRP is not recommending any increase in the landfill's intake, although the applicant is requesting to essentially double their intake. Chiquita is not the largest landfill in the US, or even in LA County. If beneficial use materials are included, reportedly Chiquita exceeded Sunshine Canyon's tonnage for 2016, but Sunshine Canyon had significantly more overall tonnage in prior years, 2016 appears to be an anomaly, and landfill size comparisons are normally based on waste disposal tonnage rather than overall tonnage of all materials, so I believe Sunshine is still considered the biggest landfill in LA County. The largest landfill in the US is reportedly Apex Landfill near Las Vegas or Newton County landfill in Indiana, although the numbers change from year to year. Chiquita Canyon isn't among the top 10 largest US landfills, although Sunshine Canyon is according to some of the lists I've seen. I understand your concerns and those of others in the community, and want to make sure that everyone involved on all sides is treated fairly and given a chance to participate in the process and have their voices heard.

The April 19 hearing will be in downtown LA at our hearing room at 9:00 am. There will be an opportunity for people to give offsite testimony during the hearing or to testify in person in downtown LA. The offsite location will probably be at the Stevenson Ranch Library, and will be at the same time as the hearing in downtown LA. People at this location will be able to watch and listen to the hearing downtown as well as to speak and participate in the hearing. More details will follow and will be posted on our website. Let me know if you have further questions. Thanks.

#### **Richard Claghorn**

Principal Regional Planning Assistant Zoning Permits North Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1348 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Phone: 213-974-6443

From: Laurel Taylor [mailto:laurel-taylor@sbcglobal.net] Sent: Sunday, March 12, 2017 5:11 PM

#### To: Richard Claghorn <rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: Chiquita Canyon expansion

Mr. Claghorn,

A Modest Proposal:

After attending the public meeting regarding Chiquita Canyon Landfills' request for expansion on March 1, 2017 and reviewing your website, several things have become quite apparent.

1. Your site represents only half the equation, i.e., why are the "support" letters, (most of them fraudulently acquired) very obviously displayed while any mention of opposition is buried. This seems unfairly skewed don't you think?

2. There seems to be a real conflict of interest issue here. If your department is in charge of deciding whether to permit the landfill to expand and become the nation's largest, but also clearly stands to gain financially from this decision ,(the \$10,000 retainer, and the \$30,000 draw down account, etc.), then how can you be impartial? Draft conditions pg.9 of 60, "This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee,....until all monies have been paid."

3. As a resident of Val Verde I find the attempts to inform us of what has been happening and proposed has been woefully, although hopefully not willfully, inadequate. I only fully became aware when the notice of the hearing on March 1 was delivered. There is total confusion at least on my end of the valley. I don't feel that we have had the time to present our side and procure the counsel we need.

After talking with neighbors after the meeting there was still confusion and someone thought that the proposal was simply to continue at the current rate, "business as usual" and not actually to expand to 400 acres and 12,000 tons of waste a day. 4. Your own report states that," the revised air quality analysis .. concludes that combined construction and operation emissions....

would result in potentially significant impacts. Mitigation measures have been proposed, but potential air quality impacts would remain

significant and unavoidable." How can that possibly be that acceptable to you? Would it be acceptable if your grandchildren lived where I live?

5. Your team took a field trip to the landfill. Again that is only half the equation. So,...

Here is my modest proposal. Perhaps you and your team could take a second field trip to see the other side. It would give you the opportunity to see what I stand to lose. Come see my home and garden, the one it took me eight years to find and a lifetime to save for. The peaceful home in a quiet, friendly community that would be destroyed by the nuisance odors, smog and traffic of the largest landfill in the country. My quality of life is compromised every time I smell that stench now. I can't imagine how bad it will be if they double in size in intake!!

I think if you visit my little slice of the American dream you might understand why our group was so unruly at the meeting. For us, it's not just "business as usual", it's personal and our homes, our quality of life is being threatened. I hope you will consider my proposal carefully.

Respectfully, Laurel Taylor

From:Bruce Campbell <madroneweb@aol.com>Sent:Monday, March 13, 2017 2:26 PMTo:Richard ClaghornCc:fifthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; FourthDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Sheila@bos.lacounty.gov;<br/>MarkRidley-Thomas@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.govSubject:Chiquita landfill expansion proposal

March 13, 2017

Bruce Campbell 3520 Overland Ave. # A 149 Los Angeles, CA 90034

Mr. Richard Claghorn Dept. of Regional Planning Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Claghorn and honorable members of the L.A. County Board of Supervisors,

I hope to write another comment later today, but I first wanted to assure that this particular brief comment makes it into the record and hopefully will stand out when considering the proposed expansion of the Chiquita Landfill.

I have researched the extreme PCB levels found especially in caulking (which was used between 1940 and 1980), in soil, in ventilation systems and elsewhere in adjacent Malibu schools.

Please consider this, the Santa Monica Malibu Unified School Board realizes they have to remove contaminated soil before they can build on an area of campus. They removed some soil with almost no precautions, and toxic dust blew around the campus during that summer session.

PCBs legally must be removed under the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 if they are found at 50 parts per million or greater. (I heard in the past year that there was a PCB level at a Malibu school even higher than the 470,000 ppm found in the woodshop area of Malibu High School.)

Thus, it is very toxic so should be removed from campuses where students, teachers, and staff can be exposed. SO TO WHERE IS THIS TOXIC SOIL LADEN WITH ILLEGAL LEVELS OF PCBs TAKEN? ANSWER: IT WAS HAULED TO THE CHIQUITA LANDFILL !!!

QUESTION: Since the material with substantial PCB needed to be removed from the Malibu High School area due to its illegal level of toxicity, WHY WASN'T THE DIRT LADEN WITH PCBs TAKEN TO A CLASS I TOXIC DUMP(?) – rather than to a more "conventional" landfill like Chiquita?

While this anecdote is referring to past removal of soil substantially laden with PCBs, yet a judge did order the SMMUSD to remove the PCB material before this decade elapses (or if they do not, they cannot use the buildings which house them). I have not researched lately to see whether other shipments of toxic materials from the adjoining Malibu schools are also being taken to Chiquita, but it sure does not give one much faith in the operator of Chiquita. Is there a certain level of toxic material within mostly dirt that Chiquita can handle?

How are shipments handled? Does the SMMUS District call and say we want to dump some dirt and trash at Chiquita, and you say sure then come on out? I was thinking if it was almost entirely dirt, then that can be sold, so why would one haul it to the dump? Perhaps some miscellaneous litter and construction trash are included with dirt to make it look like

it is miscellaneous material being dumped – rather than mostly dirt / soil laden with illegal levels of polychlorinated biphenyls.

Before any consideration of breaking one's promise to the local mostly Latino working-class community by pondering dump expansion, we need to know precisely how careful the Chiquita landfill operators are as far as accepting toxic material which should be taken to a Class I toxic dump. For instance, is Chiquita accepting additional shipments of material which contain illegal levels of PCBs from the Santa Monica Malibu School District, and if so, what are the claims or assurances as to whether there are toxic materials in such truckloads?

Among the factors you consider, please consider whether the Chiquita landfill is seeking to only accept waste that conventional landfills can accept -- or are they known as a landfill in which to dump illegal levels of toxic substances while generally posing as basic trash?

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope to write more on this important subject later today.

Sincerely yours,

**Bruce Campbell** 

From: Sent: To: Subject: Lynne Girdlestone <lynnegirdlestone@att.net> Monday, March 13, 2017 5:35 PM Richard Claghorn Project #R2004-00559-(5)

I oppose Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion!

Dear Mr. Claghorn:

I am a 27-year resident of Santa Clarita. There are so many negative issues regarding this landfill I cannot understand why Los Angeles County would even be considering the approval of renewing, let alone expanding, the contract for its use – except MONEY. Today it seems acceptable to sacrifice *anything* – even the lives of people – for the sake of money. This is not the city, the county, the country, the world I want to live in.

Unlike many decisions facing a Planning Commission or a County Board of Supervisors, you have an excellent alternative (Mesquite) just waiting to be put into service – where all the negative impacts to thousands of people and their environment are eliminated. I urge you and the Supervisors to choose people over profits and implement that alternative at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely,

Lynne Girdlestone

18911 Circle of Friends

Newhall CA 91321
From:
 Bruce Campbell <madroneweb@aol.com>

 Sent:
 Monday, March 13, 2017 5:04 PM

 To:
 firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; SecondDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Sheila@bos.lacounty.gov;

 Subject:
 comment on proposed Chiquita Landfill expansion (part two)

March 13, 2017

Bruce Campbell 3520 Overland Ave. # A 149 Los Angeles, CA 90034

Mr. Richard Claghorn Dept. of Regional Planning Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Claghorn, honorable members of the L.A. County Board of Supervisors, and to whom it may concern,

This is the second part of my comment on the proposed expansion of the Chiquita Landfill site.

Not only am I concerned about toxic materials improperly dumped at the Chiquita Landfill site (as mentioned in my comment sent earlier today in regards to Chiquita accepting waste from the Santa Monica Malibu Unified School District which had illegally high levels of PCBs), but I am also concerned about the broken promise to the community that the dump would be closed after reaching what was considered its capacity.

In addition, more methane emissions as well as dust generation will be two impacts of an expanded Chiquita Landfill. The current federal administration is seeking to eliminate the methane regulations enacted by the Obama Administration following the Aliso Canyon major natural gas leak and other realizations of a significant problem with methane. There is a lot to be concerned about in regards to releases of this potent greenhouse gas within the 60-year time frame.

Dust emissions in the Santa Clarita Valley already exceed national standards for some particulate matter. Unfortunately, proposed expansion of the Chiquita Landfill, the proposed Newhall Ranch development (largest development ever proposed in California), and the proposal to widen Interstate 5 will result in **quite an increase in dust emissions (as well as in construction-related emissions).** This is the case even besides the preposterous proposal to **bring in a bunch of fill dirt (including to the Santa Clara River floodplain itself**) as a prelude to construction of the giant Newhall Ranch development.

Seeing that mere consideration of the proposed Chiquita landfill expansion is basically a promise broken to the Val Verde working-class community, this is made worse by realizing that **diesel emissions (with their over 40 carcinogens)** and methane will continue to spew anew if the landfill is expanded. And it is clear that the dust already in the air of the Santa Clarita Valley combined with more dust from the Chiquita Landfill, combined with dust from the giant Newhall Ranch development (including from considerable dirt hauled in on which to build Newhall Ranch homes), combined with dust from Hwy. 5 expansion will certainly exacerbate (rather than alleviate) the serious dust / particulate matter problem in the vicinity.

I call for a fulfillment of the promise to the community that the facility should be shut after receiving its designated additional tonnage (which has now occurred).

But if the facility is not shut (or not shut immediately) despite earlier promises, there had better be considerable serious mitigation measures. Part of such mitigation measures should involve cleaning up trucks and bulldozers and other construction equipment which emit such dangerous pollutants as "black carbon" and "diesel". Also, how much consideration has there been to increasing carbon-absorbing (and to an extent, dust-controlling) vegetation in the general Chiquita Landfill area? Are certain absorbent trees or other preferred vegetation considered and advised for related mitigation?

All in all, mitigation will not suffice and we approach this decision where the promise to the community is being broken by even considering a Chiquita dump expansion.

Val Verde deserves justice! It is not a banana republic, and will no longer accept abuse from polluting outsiders!

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

**Bruce Campbell** 

From: Sent: To: Subject: Charity Vincent <charityjv@gmail.com> Tuesday, March 14, 2017 10:17 AM Richard Claghorn Chiquita Canyon

### Mr. Claghorn,

I strongly oppose the expansion of Chiquita Canyon. The landfill should be closed. It has reached it's capacity and does not NEED to accept anymore trash. Most citizens in Santa Clarita would agree to divert the garbage to the less populated Mesquite, instead of right next door. We should keep our valley as clean and beautiful as possible, not stock pile it with garbage at the convenience of the landfill profiters.

Thank you, Charity Vincent





State of California • Natural Resources Agency Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources – District 2 1000 South Hill Road • Suite 116 Ventura, CA 93003-4458 (805) 654-4761 • FAX (805) 654-4765

March 16, 2017

Mr. Richard J Bruckner Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Bruckner:

FINAL ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT REPORT – CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL PROJECT COUNTY PROJECT NO. R2004-00559-(5)

The Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (Division) has reviewed the final environmental impact report for the above referenced project. There are no wells/facilities or other oil infrastructure that would need Division approval and so the Division has no objections to this project.

The Division is mandated by Section 3106 of the Public Resources Code to supervise the drilling, operation, maintenance, and abandonment of oil and gas wells. This is for the purposes of preventing: 1) damage to life, health, property, and natural resources; 2) damage to underground and surface waters suitable for irrigation or domestic use; 3) loss of oil, gas, or reservoir energy; and 4) damage to oil and gas deposits by infiltration of water and other causes.

Well information and records are available on our Division website (<u>www.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/index.html</u>). Should any oilfield evidence be discovered during the project development, please contact our office immediately.

If you have any questions, please contact our district office at (805) 654-4761.

Sincerely,

el 2

Patricia A. Abel Coastal District Deputy

cc: CEQA – Unit EQ-EIR Chrono

From: Sent: To: Subject: ruth jeffs <ruthiam@sbcglobal.net> Wednesday, March 22, 2017 5:15 PM Richard Claghorn Project #R2204-0059-(5) Conditional Use Permit 2004-00042

Dear Mr. Claghorn,

I strongly oppose the expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. It reached the agreed on limit in June of last year. Please do not approve any further dumping at this location. Thank you.

Sincerely,

**Ruth Jeffs** 

| From:<br>Sent: | Jeremiah Dockray <jdockray@gmail.com><br/>Friday, March 24, 2017 2:32 PM</jdockray@gmail.com>  |
|----------------|--|
| То:            | Richard Claghorn   |
| Cc:            | kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; sheila@bos.lacounty.gov; markridley-thomas@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; exec@scope.org |
| Subject:       | Public Records Request and Non-compliant Chiquita Hearing notice Posting   |
| Attachments:   | CalEPA Settlement Response on Complaint.pdf; SCOPE Chiquita PRA request.pdf; 20170323_170555.jpg   |

Hello Mr. Claghorn,

Please see the attached PRA request, photo, and CalEPA letter. Please enter all of this in the administrative record, and please notify me upon receipt of this request. Thank you!

1

Best, Jeremiah Dockray SCOPE Board Member 661-670-8664 Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment TO PROMOTE, PROTECT AND PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENT, ECOLOGY AND QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE SANTA CLARITA VALLEY POST OFFICE BOX 1182, SANTA CLARITA, CA 91386



SCOPE

March 23, 2017

Mr. Richard Claghorn Los Angeles County Regional Planning Dept. 320 W. Temple St. Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Incomplete posting of meeting notice for Aril 19<sup>th</sup> meeting And <u>PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST</u>

Dear Mr. Claghorn:

I would like to report to you what seems to be a violation of not only the County's signage rules for meeting notices, but also a violation of the intent of the settlement agreement made with the State of California regarding our Civil Rights Complaint.

While we certainly appreciated having the meeting closer to the community of Val Verde, many people from that neighborhood were not allowed to speak due to the time constraints of the room rental. We were informed by the commission that an off- site video feed for the downtown April 19<sup>th</sup> meeting would be arranged in the Santa Clarita Valley to try to accommodate those people.

You informed us that the location would be the Stevenson Ranch library. However, that information appears nowhere on the meeting signage posted in the community of Val Verde and elsewhere. So how is it that people are supposed to know about this more convenient location?

We believe that the failure to post this local location is a substantial violation of the county code 22.60.175 which pertains to posting of hearing notices.

The posting requirements state:

Hearing notices must be posted 30 days prior to the hearing

"Content and Lettering. Major block-style letters three inches in height shall state: "NOTICE OF HEARING." Minor letters one and one-half inches in height shall specify the case number and the phone number to be called for information. A notice of hearing the same as that specified by subsection A.2 of <u>Section 22.60.174</u> indicating the time, date, and location of the public hearing, the case number, a telephone number which may be called for information about the proposal, a description of the proposal, and a map showing the boundaries of the subject property in relation to the adjoining public roads, shall be securely affixed to the sign;" It will deprive local community members who were unable to speak at the March 1st hearing and who were promised a closer location, the timely knowledge they need to have to be able to utilize such a location. We have attached a picture of the incomplete Hearing signage.

We therefore believe that the meeting is not properly noticed in accordance with the County code and ask that the hearing be re-set so that the hearing notice can be re-posted with the additional location and proper 30 days notice.

#### PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST

We also request a copy of the speaker cards that were received by the County staff for the March 1<sup>st</sup> hearing along with any list or other documentation that would indicate who spoke at the hearing. We request that this information be provided digitally within the 10 day requirements of the California Public Records Act law to: exec@scope.org

Thank you in advance for your time.

Sincerely,

Count

Jeremiah Dockray Board Member 661 670-8663

2 Attachments: Picture of Hearing posting Letter from Cal EPA regarding settlement of the Civil Rights complaint



Edmund G. Brown Jr. Governor Matthew Rodriquez Secretary for Environmental Protection

January 4, 2017

Lynne Plambeck & Sara Sage Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment P.O. Box 1182 Canyon Country, CA 91386 exec@scope.org sagefamily@sbcglobal.net Erica Larsen & Jeremiah Dockray Citizens for Chiquita Canyon Landfill Compliance 30651 Arlington St. Val Verde, CA 91384 C4CCLC@gmail.com

Noe Rico 30647 Arlington St. Val Verde, CA 91384

Theresa Martinez 31103 Deiwood St. Val Verde, CA 91384

Re: Civil Rights Complaint Regarding the Proposed Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion

Dear Mmes. Plambeck, Sage, Larsen and Martinez and Mssrs. Dockray and Rico:

We are writing to close the above-referenced complaint and thank you for bringing this matter our attention. We appreciated the opportunity for our staff to meet with you to discuss your complaint and to learn more about the issues related to outreach and language access in your community.

As we discussed, the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Air Resources Board and CalRecycle have no jurisdiction over this complaint under Government Code section 11135 because these agencies do not provide funding for the entities and activities that are the subject of your complaint. Accordingly, we are concluding our review of the complaint.

We share your interest in improving community outreach and access to decision-making processes, and we have discussed these issues with representatives from the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (Department). As a result of those discussions, we understand that the Department has agreed to take the following actions regarding public notices and processes as the proposed Chiquita Canyon Landfill project moves forward:

- Provide all future hearing notices for the Project in English and Spanish;
- Publish Spanish language hearing notices for the Project in the Signal or other local newspaper satisfactory to the petitioners;
- Post a large sign (8-feet-wide by four-feet-high) at the Val Verde community "bulletin board" notifying the community in English and Spanish of upcoming Project hearings;

Air Resources Board • Department of Pesticide Regulation • Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery • Department of Toxic Substances Control Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment • State Water Resources Control Board • Regional Water Quality Control Boards Page 2

- Hold one additional Hearing Examiner hearing in the community regarding the recirculated draft environmental impact report for the Project;
- Hold a Regional Planning Commission hearing in the community to consider approval or denial of the Project;
- Translate into Spanish any regular or special meeting agenda for the Regional Planning Commission or Hearing Examiner on which the Project is included as an agenda item, and post both the English and Spanish agendas in the same manner;
- Translate Project hearing notices into Spanish, and mail both English and Spanish notices to all residents in the unincorporated Val Verde community;
- If requested by a member of the public at least 24 hours prior to a Regional Planning Commission or Hearing Examiner hearing on the Project, provide concurrent Spanishlanguage translation services via headset, as well as a translator for Spanish speakers addressing the Commission or Hearing Examiner; and translate the Executive Summary of the Project's recirculated draft environmental impact report and make it available on the Department's website.

We believe that these future commitments regarding the site will allow for full and equal participation by ensuring that the community will be informed about the project and have opportunities to provide input. We appreciate your bringing this matter to our attention and support the County's efforts to explore ways to enhance public participation in its processes.

Thank you, and please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions. Additionally, please note that the County has provided the following contact information for questions related to the above commitments: Rob Glaser (rglaser@planning.lacounty.gov), Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning.

Sincerely,

Matthew Rodriquez Secretary for Environmental Protection California Environmental Protection Agency

Scott Smithline Director California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery

cc: See next page.

Richard Corev

Executive Director California Air Resources Board

Page 3

cc:

Joseph M. Nicchitta Deputy County Counsel Property Division County of Los Angeles Office of the County Counsel 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012-2713

Mary C. Wickham County Counsel County of Los Angeles Office of the County Counsel 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012-2713



| From:<br>Sent:<br>To:    | Richard Claghorn<br>Wednesday, March 29, 2017 7:29 AM<br>'Jeremiah Dockrav'  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Cc:                      | kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; sheila@bos.lacounty.gov; markridley-thomas@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; exec@scope.org   |
| Subject:<br>Attachments: | RE: Public Records Request and Non-compliant Chiquita Hearing notice Posting<br>Speaker_cards_duplicates.pdf; Speaker_Cards.pdf; Speaker_cards_did_not_speak.pdf;<br>Speaker_card_item_6.pdf; Mar. 1, 2017 RPC Hearing Transcript (large type).PDF |

#### Hello Mr. Dockray,

Pursuant to your Public Records Act request, I'm sending you digital copies of the speaker cards for the March 1, 2017 RPC hearing. I've also attached a transcript of the hearing. The transcript contains a list of the speakers, excluding the applicant, on pages 2 and 3. The speaker cards were divided into four groups: those who spoke, those who didn't speak, duplicate cards, and speaker card for item 6, public comment. The speaker cards for those who spoke also include some who didn't respond when their name was called, those who chose not to speak or who yielded their time to another speaker. There were 41 people who signed speaker cards but who did not speak due to lack of adequate time at the hearing. In all, 68 people who signed cards spoke, including the applicant. Another three didn't respond when called, and five told staff that they decided not to speak because their main points were covered by others or for other reasons. Three people had more than one speaker card filled out. One person signed up to speak on agenda item 6, public comment on issues other than the main agenda item. However, this portion of the agenda was not covered due to the time limitations. The transcript is also on our department's website at the following link:

# http://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/project\_no\_r2004\_00559\_5\_conditional\_use\_permit\_2004\_00042\_chiquita\_ca\_nyon\_/

Regarding the posting, we asked the applicant's agent to post a hearing notice that includes the remote testimony location information on the posted signs. I'm not sure if this has been done yet. Normally, the department doesn't require notices to be posted for continued public hearings, and this is the only case I know of where notices have been mailed and signs have been posted for a continued hearing date. However, we've asked that it be done in this case as a courtesy. The hearing notice with the remote testimony location has been posted on our website at the above link. There is no need to reschedule the hearing date because the posting was already done as required by the Zoning Code and this additional notice was only a courtesy to inform anyone who wasn't at the hearing on March 1 about the continued hearing date. Let me know if you have any further questions. Thanks.

#### **Richard Claghorn**

Principal Regional Planning Assistant Zoning Permits North Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1348 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Phone: 213-974-6443

From: Jeremiah Dockray [mailto:jdockray@gmail.com] Sent: Friday, March 24, 2017 2:32 PM To: Richard Claghorn <rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov> Cc: kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; sheila@bos.lacounty.gov; markridley-

1

#### thomas@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; exec@scope.org Subject: Public Records Request and Non-compliant Chiquita Hearing notice Posting

Hello Mr. Claghorn,

Please see the attached PRA request, photo, and CalEPA letter. Please enter all of this in the administrative record, and please notify me upon receipt of this request. Thank you!

Best, Jeremiah Dockray SCOPE Board Member 661-670-8664

From: Sent: To: Subject: Laurie Finkelstein <laurie@lauriebethart.com> Friday, March 24, 2017 5:12 PM Richard Claghorn Chiquita Canyon landfill expansion

Dear Mr. Claghorn,

I oppose expanding the Chiquita Canyon Landfill

- This dump is in a growing area, located too close to vulnerable populations such as schools with young children.

- This expansion will worsen the air quality for the entire Santa Clarita Valley.

- This dump is located too close to an active fault line. It threatens our groundwater.

- It is unfair to further burden our residents when other options like Mesquite Landfill are available.

- Constituent health and environmental hazards should not be ignored due to financial incentives.

The County has allowed Chiquita to continue expanding beyond the original contract. It is time to close it. I have emailed the same message to:

Rob Glaser

Oscar Gomez

Kathryn Barger

Janice Hahn

Sheila Kuehl

Mark Ridley-Thomas

1

# Laurie Finkelstein 21714 Chenil Court Sant Clarita 91350

LaurieBethArt.com

.

| From:    | Rosie Ruiz                               |
|----------|--|
| Sent:    | Tuesday, March 28, 2017 11:18 AM         |
| То:      | Tanya Hauser                             |
| Cc:      | Richard Claghorn; Samuel Dea             |
| Subject: | RE: Chiquita Canyon Landfill and Schools |

Thank you for your email, it will be forward to the Regional Planning Commissioners.

From: Tanya Hauser [mailto:tanyagrace70@yahoo.com] Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 11:14 AM To: Rosie Ruiz <rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: Chiquita Canyon Landfill and Schools

Dear Rosie,

Could you please pass the following document along to each of the Planning Commissioners? They were concerned at the March 1st hearing about the proximity of schools to the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. A table of schools and their proximity is included in this document.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fapui4wUIRWtVWjOSxt3wtvPrWCQCGL38CU2MrO5Xyc/edit

Thank you very much.

Sincerely, Tanya Hauser

# Sunshine Canyon Landfill, A Message from our Future

3/1/2017 - Submitted by Members of Citizens for Chiquita Canyon Landfill Compliance - c4cclc@gmail.com

The Chiquita Canyon Landfill is in the final stages of seeking approval for an expansion, so you may have been hearing about it a lot lately or for the first time. As the upcoming public hearing is Wednesday March 1st, 6pm at Rancho Pico Junior High School [ 26250 Valencia Blvd. Stevenson Ranch 91381] the landfill has shifted into overdrive to get as many positive messages out there as they possibly can. However, there is one message which we should all pay very close attention to; how the nearby Sunshine Canyon Landfill went through a similar expansion that has impacted the nearby communities of Granada Hills and Sylmar.

Let's start with getting caught up on each project's specifics.

A Brief Comparison of Sunshine Canyon Landfill and Chiquita Canyon Landfill

| SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL (current)   | CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL (proposed)   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Class III landfill (i.e., a municipal landfill that is not<br>authorized to accept hazardous waste) <sup>1</sup> | Class III landfill (i.e., a municipal landfill that is not<br>authorized to accept hazardous waste) Plus a<br>Household Hazardous and Composting Facility |  |
| 363 acres  | 400 acres + 143 feet vertical increase to pile  |  |
| 8,300 tons per day   | 12,000 tons per day   |  |
| Nearest Residence: .3 miles <sup>2</sup>   | Nearest Residence: 900 feet   |  |
| Nearest Commercial Business (minus onsite): 761 feet<br>(north) .8 miles (south)                                 | Nearest Commercial Business (minus onsite): 500 feet<br>(east)  |  |
| Nearest School: Van Gogh Elementary - 1 mile   | Nearest School: Santa Clarita Valley International<br>Charter School (SCVi)8 miles (Proposed Landmark<br>Village Elem 500 feet)                           |  |

At first glance, these two landfills have a few similarities although Sunshine is slightly smaller than an expanded Chiquita, taking in less tonnage and farther away from residences and schools. They also both sit at gateways to the Santa Clarita Valley, Sunshine at the south and Chiquita to the north. Sunshine is nestled south of the 5 freeway intersection with the 14 Hwy, Chiquita just west of the 5 freeway on the 126 Hwy. In fact, you may have already smelled either of these landfills from the 5 on your commute and did not know its source.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/compliance/sunshine-canyon-landfill

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> http://bit.ly/SunshineCynLandfill



A scale comparison of Dodger Stadium to the size of the expansion being proposed at Chiquita Canyon Landfill

# What we can learn from Sunshine Canyon Landfill

#### HOW BAD 8,000 TONS A DAY SMELLS

Since its expansion, Sunshine has been reeling with public outcry regarding odors and traffic. Searching "sunshine canyon landfill odors" pulls up dozens of articles and case hearings written about how bad it is for residents there. Sunshine has received 119 odor violations since 2014 averaging about 30 a year.<sup>3</sup> To anyone who lives next to a landfill this is an incredible number because they know how hard it is to get a violation. You may think agents regularly track odors at landfills but in reality it is largely up to us the citizens to regulate odors and it is a very difficult process to get a violation.

Here is the process for reporting odors to the Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), the agency in charge of air quality:

- 1. They must receive 6 calls in one hour (it was 3 late last year but has returned to 6)
- 2. An agent comes out often from Diamond Bar, CA to verify the odor (or not at all due to low staffing)
- 3. The agent then goes to each complaint's address to smell the air.
- 4. After the same odor is verified at all 6 locations they then go to the landfill to verify if the air smells the same.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> http://www3.aqmd.gov/webappl/fim/prog/novnc.aspx?fac\_id=49111

#### 5. If it is indeed the same odor, a notice of violation is given.

This whole process takes hours which often means the odorous gasses may have already moved or dissipated before an agent even arrives. We can only imagine how many calls went unverified if this process was fulfilled 119 times. It also helps to illustrate how bad and how long the odors from Sunshine have to be. Residents in Val Verde, the community closest to Chiquita, already feel it is impossible to actually get a violation. Even this past Monday February 27th, calls were made after an agent had already come out and they refused to come back. It takes a lot of community effort and work to make sure the landfills are held accountable for their odors.

#### YOU DON'T HAVE TO LIVE NEXT TO A LANDFILL TO FEEL ITS EFFECTS

Sunshine's odor calls come largely from Granada Hills and Sylmar. The center of both communities sit about 3 miles away from the closest landfill border (the garbage gets dumped in various areas within those borders).<sup>4</sup>



Sunshine Canyon Landfill Proximities to the nearby communities vs. Chiquita Canyon Landfill

If Sunshine's 8,300 tons is impacting residents and businesses 3 miles away we can average that out to about 1 mile reach per 2766 tons. If we apply that to Chiquita's future impact at 12,000 tons per day, it could reach around 4.3 miles from its borders.

Here is what sits 4.3 miles from the Chiquita expansion border; just north of the Lake Hughes Road exit and the 5 in Castaic, Rio Norte Junior High to the Northeast, the intersection of McBean Parkway and Magic Mountain, and the Poe Parkway and Stevenson Ranch Parkway intersection. That is probably a lot farther into our cities than we all thought about.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> http://bit.ly/SunshineCynLandfill



Mile markers at 3 miles and 4.3 miles



General look at distances

Naturally there are other factors to take into consideration such as the east side of the landfill where the natural ridge is the lowest (the garbage pile is hundreds of feet taller than it now) combined with wind direction which very often blows west to east ... right into Santa Clarita. In addition, **Chiquita also reports it will be increasing inbound truck trips to 975 per day (**this number reflects inbound material only, not including vehicles for construction or

facilitation).<sup>5</sup> The pollution and traffic of this many trucks traveling up the 5 to the 126 will be significant, especially considering that trucks already travel from as far as Orange County, and Victorville to Chiquita.

#### SANTA CLARITA WILL HAVE A LOT OF ODOR-FILLED DEVELOPMENTS

It is easy to see many houses and businesses will be in extremely close proximity. What we don't see are the proposed and current projects for development. The IAC Commerce Center, technically in Valencia but buts up to the northeast landfill border, is being developed right now<sup>6</sup>. It will span a whopping 25 million square feet of industrial and office market space all within 1 mile of the expansion<sup>7</sup>. Likewise, Newhall Land and Farming is working right now to gain approval for the first two phases of their mega development (Landmark Village and Mission Village). It will be the largest development in the United States and sit literally just across the 126 from the dump. The development in its entirety will include over 20,000 homes and a handful of schools.



Chiquita Landfill Expansion comparison with Newhall Land Development both seeking approval right now

One proposed elementary school, Landmark Village Elementary, would be about 417 feet from the current entrance of the landfill on the other side of the 126.

<sup>6</sup> http://www.scvedc.org/clientuploads/SCV%20Business%20Parks/SCVEDC\_Map\_Insert\_\_CROP.jpg

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Chapter 1 -1.6.2 Summary of Operational Baseline and Proposed Project -- Trucks, *Table 1-3. Operational Baseline* with Proposed Project Truck Trips

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> http://www.iaccommercecenter.com



Landmark Village Elementary School location, with superimposed map images from the Landmark Village EIR.

#### IT WILL AFFECT OUR SCHOOLS, WORKPLACES, AND HOMES

Van Gogh Elementary is 2 miles away from Sunshine Canyon Landfill and had to install charcoal filters in their school to mitigate landfill odors. However, odors still seep into classrooms and hang over the schoolyard.

"The odors that we smell in the morning terrorize our morning routine," said Hindi-Chahayed, president of the parent-teacher organization at Van Gogh Charter School, considered the epicenter for landfill smell. "Kids hold their noses when coming to class. We cannot hold morning assembly."

"The smell is torture," she said.<sup>8</sup>

This from a school 2 miles away from Sunshine accepting 3,700 tons LESS than what Chiquita is asking for. How bad will it then be for schools like SCVI Charter School which sits *less than a mile* from the future landfill border? How about the kids at Live Oak Elementary or Castaic Middle School? If Van Gogh Charter has filters that can't keep odorous gasses at bay how will we fare when our landfill will be bigger and schools closer? If we survey the surrounding area of the expansion there are 8 schools and preschools 3 miles or less from the future landfill. In fact, 13,228 kids will be going to school or preschool within 5 miles or less of the landfill expansion border<sup>9</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>http://www.dailynews.com/environment-and-nature/20160827/the-smell-is-torture-san-fernando-valley-residents-say-of-sunshine-canyon-landfill

Student numbers gathered from 2016 at www.schooldigger.com

| Here | they | are: |
|------|------|------|
|------|------|------|

| School                                    | Number of<br>Students | Miles from Chiquita Landfill |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Santa Clarita Valley International - SCVi | 933                   | 0.8                          |
| Val Verde Head Start - Preschool          | 10-15                 | 0.8                          |
| Live Oak Elementary                       | 558                   | 1.1                          |
| Castaic Middle School                     | 933                   | 2.02                         |
| Castaic Elementary                        | 489                   | 2.2                          |
| Fay's Child Care                          | 14                    | 2.3                          |
| West Ranch High School                    | 2,340                 | 2.7                          |
| Rancho Pico Jr. High                      | 966                   | 3                            |
| Oak Hills Elementary                      | 613                   | 3.05                         |
| Sloan Canyon Preschool                    | 40                    | 3.37                         |
| Tutor Time Castaic                        | 80                    | 3.37                         |
| Valencia High School                      | 3,177                 | 4                            |
| Tutor Time Stevenson Ranch                | 120                   | 4.25                         |
| Rio Norte Jr. High                        | 1,144                 | 4.5                          |
| Sunshine Day Camp                         | 100                   | 4.5                          |
| Bridgeport Elementary                     | 968                   | 4.6                          |
| Charles Helmers Elementary                | 738                   | 4.6                          |

Google map of these schools here: http://bit.ly/ccl5mileschools

#### ODORS ARE MORE THAN JUST AN INCONVENIENCE, THEY ARE HARMFUL TO YOUR HEALTH

We may not consider the health impact of smelling odorous gasses on a regular basis but landfill gasses are extremely dangerous.

"Landfills can produce objectionable odors and landfill gas can move through soil and collect in nearby buildings. Of the gases produced in landfills, ammonia, sulfides, methane, and carbon dioxide are of most concern. Ammonia and hydrogen sulfide are responsible for most of the odors at landfills. Methane is flammable and concentrations have sometimes exceeded explosive levels indoors. Methane and carbon dioxide can also collect in nearby buildings and displace oxygen." -- NY State Department of Health<sup>10</sup>

SCVi and Live Oak Elementary specifically are at ground zero as well as residents in Val Verde, the Valencia Commerce Center and along the 126 (future Newhall development). Each have been identified as cancer risk sites within the current Environmental Impact Report. This is not a scare tactic as the landfill has made it out to be, the agency hired to evaluate their project created this information in *Figure 11.5-Maximum Health Impact Locations from Proposed Project Construction and Operation.*<sup>11</sup> For a searchable map please visit: <u>http://bit.lv/CCLCancerMap</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> https://www.health.ny.gov/environmental/outdoors/air/landfill\_gas.htm

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8rxv9anzSileVVYVzEwR0FYbmc/view



Live Oak Elementary, homes in Val Verde, the Travel Village, and the post office will be major epicenters for landfill offgas

# So how do we avoid another Sunshine Canyon Mess?

Some will probably say that this comparison could cast Chiquita in a favorable light. After all, some of what we are doing is trying to predict the future. For all the promises, research, planning, and PR charming that Chiquita has done throughout the valley and beyond, we can only reply that Sunshine made those promises too. And here we are, with a twisted gift of being able to see where we could end up.

#### WE HAVE TO FIGHT TO SHUT IT DOWN NOW BEFORE IT EXPANDS

After all of the hardship that Granada Hills and Sylmar endure and the massive amounts of odor violations, Sunshine Landfill is only getting a slap on the wrist. Currently all they have received is an odor abatement to reduce their intake to 6,000 tons a day. Now let's take a step back here and consider any other business staying open after receiving 30 violations in the last 3 years...landfills seem to have tremendous leeway when it comes to public health. To try and mitigate the Chiquita Canyon Expansion will mean hours of residents efforts and calls to only have small measures in response. It is an extreme burden on residents and businesses to regulate landfill odors after it has been approved so we must fight to not let this go through as it is proposed!

#### SUPPORT THE VAL VERDE CIVIC ASSOCIATION

The community of Val Verde already saw the writing on the wall in 1997 during the last Chiquita Canyon Expansion...yes this isn't its first expansion and the landfill has been affecting Val Verde for over 40 years now. The Val Verde Civic Association has a memorandum of agreement with the landfill that it would close once it reached 23 million tons or November 24, 2019 whichever occurs first. Chiquita surpassed 23 million tons this past June but the Department of Regional Planning gave them a backdoor option of a clean hands waiver to continue to operate.

What is going on by Sunshine means every single resident in Val Verde will be smelling the landfill on a regular basis and lose their abilities to enjoy their homes just like Granada Hills. Use this agreement in your arguments and support their fight to protect the community from further pollution. Like their facebook page at facebook.com/vvcivic

#### ATTEND HEARINGS AND DEMAND YOUR COUNCILS OPPOSE THIS EXPANSION

Tonight is one of the last hearings on the landfill expansion. Landfill supporters have turned it into a partisan issue about supporting a business over the safety and well being of our communities. Please come out to support the opposition of this expansion:

#### Public Hearing on Chiquita Expansion attended by Regional Planning Commissioners\*\*

- Wednesday, March 1, at 6:00pm at Rancho Pico Junior High School, 26255 Valencia Blvd., Santa Clarita, CA 91381 (Limited parking. Rideshare, if possible. Additional parking may be available at the nearby West Ranch High School.)
- \*\*Wear red and a dust mask to show solidarity of opposition to the project

Check into when your local council or HOA meets and have them write in letters of opposition and better yet... get involved! West Ranch Town Council for example, is an avid support of the expansion when 3 of the largest schools are the next closest after Castaic.

#### DEMAND WE START USING THE MESQUITE REGIONAL LANDFILL FOR OUR WASTE NEEDS

Call on LA County to put an end to kicking this can down the road, and make a bold decision to keep our present and future communities from further risk. Do not grant this expansion, and put in place a plan to reduce waste and keep what needs to be in a landfill away from us and other communities. It's time to start using the Mesquite Regional Landfill which half a billion tax dollars were spent to create. The reason we don't use it now? There is too much landfill capacity in LA County. There is no reason for this landfill to expand if a surplus of landfill capacity exists and our dollars are not being used to rail waste out to the desert away from homes and businesses!

#### WRITE LETTERS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

If you aren't able to attend the hearing or even if you can... write your representatives and demand they oppose this landfill expansion! It is vital to use your voice in this fight!

Here is where to send your letters with reference to: Project #R2004-00559-(5)

| <ul> <li>5 Los Angeles County Supervisors:</li> <li>Kathryn Barger (213) 974-5555</li> <li>Janice Hahn (213) 974-4444</li> <li>Sheila Kuehl (213) 974-3333,</li> <li>Mark Ridley-Thomas (213) 974-2222</li> <li>Hilda L. Solis (213) 974-4111</li> <li>executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov</li> <li>Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration</li> <li>500 W. Temple Street</li> </ul> | Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning:<br>(213) 974-6443<br>zoningldcc@planning.lacounty.gov<br>rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov<br>rglaser@planning.lacounty.gov<br>ogomez@planning.lacounty.gov<br>320 West Temple Street, 13 <sup>th</sup> Floor<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012 |
|---|--|
| 500 W. Temple Street<br>Los Ángeles, CA 90012   |  |
|   |  |

#### DON'T GIVE UP AND JOIN US!

51

Citizens for Chiquita Canyon Landfill Compliance has stayed in the fight and done great work to push back on the landfill's tactics to undermine them. We consist of individuals from all over the Santa Clarita Valley, of ALL political affiliations and interests, so please like our facebook page and join in the efforts to defend our rights to healthy living and work environments. Like our facebook page at <u>www.facebook.com/c4cclc</u> or shoot us an email at c4cclc@gmail.com

ACC4004

We are focused on doing what is right for the community... doubling the capacity of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill is absolutely not. Sunshine Canyon Landfill is all the proof we need.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Rosie Ruiz Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:38 PM Richard Claghorn; Samuel Dea FW: Information for 5th dist commish dodgers\_stadium1.png; proximity\_mile\_map\_03\_rings.png; proximity\_map\_CASTAIC\_Points.png

Here's his emails.

From: Lloyd & Nancy Carder [mailto:carderfam@yahoo.com] Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:31 PM To: Rosie Ruiz <rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: Information for 5th dist commish

Please forward this to Mr Pat Modugno and offer my sadness that I had so much trouble getting these to him. I have 3 more maps of the Five Point project that I have digitized but will send next.

Dear Mr. Pat Modugno

These are the proximity maps of the landfill for the local schools and businesses you asked me for. From map 3 we can see how close the Five Point project and schools will be.

The community still has not been able to get true third party gas and fume analysis done. They have been blocked 2 times I know of but they are saying more. The 2 by them selves will be enough to show what is needed legally.

I approved this project as a past councilman with full knowledge of the closing agreement and that is the reason I was re-elected by the residents of my region. I would like to come in and discuss this with you maybe even near home?

My contact information to him is:

Lloyd Carder II President Castaic Area Town Council C 661.600.2134 carderfam@yahoo.com lloyd@pacificautomatedwelding.com







From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Lloyd & Nancy Carder <carderfam@yahoo.com> Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:40 PM Rosie Ruiz Richard Claghorn; Samuel Dea Re: Information for 5th dist commish

I will send you the second email after class tonight. I need to scan them first.

Thanks,

Lloyd Carder II

From: Rosie Ruiz <rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov> To: Lloyd & Nancy Carder <carderfam@yahoo.com> Cc: Richard Claghorn <rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov>; Samuel Dea <sdea@planning.lacounty.gov> Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:37 PM Subject: RE: Information for 5th dist commish

Mr. Carder, Your email will be sent to the Regional Planning Commission. Thank you.

ROSIE O. RUIZ | Commission Services

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning 213.974.6409 | http://planning.lacounty.gov | rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.

From: Lloyd & Nancy Carder [mailto:carderfam@yahoo.com] Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:31 PM To: Rosie Ruiz <rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: Information for 5th dist commish

Please forward this to Mr Pat Modugno and offer my sadness that I had so much trouble getting these to him. I have 3 more maps of the Five Point project that I have digitized but will send next.

Dear Mr. Pat Modugno

These are the proximity maps of the landfill for the local schools and businesses you asked me for. From map 3 we can see how close the Five Point project and schools will be.

The community still has not been able to get true third party gas and fume analysis done. They have been blocked 2 times I know of but they are saying more. The 2 by them selves will be enough to show what is needed legally.

I approved this project as a past councilman with full knowledge of the closing agreement and that is the reason I was re-elected by the residents of my region. I would like to come in and discuss this with you maybe even near home?

My contact information to him is:

Lloyd Carder II President Castaic Area Town Council C 661.600.2134 <u>carderfam@yahoo.com</u> lloyd@pacificautomatedwelding.com

From: Sent: To: Subject: Mary Holzberger <mbhjmy@sbcglobal.net> Wednesday, March 29, 2017 7:49 AM Richard Claghorn Chiquita Landfill

**To Richard Claghorn** 

We moved to Valencia nearly 10 years ago. It was the perfect place to retire.

We are now re-considering this move.

Please vote 'NO' to any expansion of the Chiquita Landfill...protect our Valley.

Sincerely

**Beth Holzberger** 

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Attachments: Lloyd & Nancy Carder <carderfam@yahoo.com> Wednesday, March 29, 2017 9:21 AM Samuel Dea; Rosie Ruiz Richard Claghorn Re: Information for 5th dist commish Scan 2.jpeg; Scan 1.jpeg

He wanted this 2 weeks ago but I have had trouble finding who to send it to, to get it to him. Clever way to not have the commissioners educated or isolate them . I know they would get a lot of hate mail but there needs to be a better way to get them the info they wanted. Wish he could have had Rosie's email on his card that he hands out to the public.

Here are the other maps for his viewing. Sterling was to send me a map too but he was out of town but said he would send it today. He forgot on Monday return. Sterling was another project I helped get approved with the knowledge the landfill would be closed. I remain concerned that when we approve projects the other projects near by are not accessed. The council works hard to secure the records of the nearby projects and how they will impact the local area and already approved projects.

Please send him my email copys too.

Best Regards,

Lloyd Carder President Castaic Area Town Council 661.600.2134

From: Samuel Dea <sdea@planning.lacounty.gov> To: Lloyd & Nancy Carder <carderfam@yahoo.com>; Rosie Ruiz <rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov> Cc: Richard Claghorn <rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov> Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 3:19 PM Subject: RE: Information for 5th dist commish

Are we intending to send his message with the hearing package next week or forward this directly to Commissioner Modugno?

From: Lloyd & Nancy Carder [mailto:carderfam@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:40 PM
To: Rosie Ruiz <rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Richard Claghorn <rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov>; Samuel Dea <sdea@planning.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Re: Information for 5th dist commish

I will send you the second email after class tonight. I need to scan them first.

Thanks,

From: Rosie Ruiz <<u>rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov</u>> To: Lloyd & Nancy Carder <<u>carderfam@yahoo.com</u>> Cc: Richard Claghorn <<u>rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov</u>>; Samuel Dea <<u>sdea@planning.lacounty.gov</u>> Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:37 PM Subject: RE: Information for 5th dist commish

Mr. Carder, Your email will be sent to the Regional Planning Commission. Thank you.

#### **ROSIE O. RUIZ | Commission Services**

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning 213.974.6409 | <u>http://planning.lacounty.gov</u> | <u>rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov</u>



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.

From: Lloyd & Nancy Carder [mailto:carderfam@yahoo.com] Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:31 PM To: Rosie Ruiz <<u>rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov</u>> Subject: Information for 5th dist commish

Please forward this to Mr Pat Modugno and offer my sadness that I had so much trouble getting these to him. I have 3 more maps of the Five Point project that I have digitized but will send next.

Dear Mr. Pat Modugno

These are the proximity maps of the landfill for the local schools and businesses you asked me for. From map 3 we can see how close the Five Point project and schools will be.

The community still has not been able to get true third party gas and fume analysis done. They have been blocked 2 times I know of but they are saying more. The 2 by them selves will be enough to show what is needed legally.

I approved this project as a past councilman with full knowledge of the closing agreement and that is the reason I was re-elected by the residents of my region. I would like to come in and discuss this with you maybe even near home?

My contact information to him is:
Lloyd Carder II President Castaic Area Town Council C 661.600.2134 <u>carderfam@yahoo.com</u> <u>lloyd@pacificautomatedwelding.com</u>

.





From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Lloyd & Nancy Carder <carderfam@yahoo.com> Wednesday, March 29, 2017 9:24 AM Samuel Dea; Rosie Ruiz Richard Claghorn Re: Information for 5th dist commish

You do realize from this email it looks like the public and their local representatives do not have the same access to the commissioners as do the developers and in this case the landfill.

Just something to think about.

Lloyd Carder II President Castaic Area Town Council C 661.600.2134 carderfam@yahoo.com

From: Samuel Dea <sdea@planning.lacounty.gov> To: Lloyd & Nancy Carder <carderfam@yahoo.com>; Rosie Ruiz <rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov> Cc: Richard Claghorn <rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov> Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 3:19 PM Subject: RE: Information for 5th dist commish

Are we intending to send his message with the hearing package next week or forward this directly to Commissioner Modugno?

From: Lloyd & Nancy Carder [mailto:carderfam@yahoo.com] Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:40 PM To: Rosie Ruiz <rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov> Cc: Richard Claghorn <rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov>; Samuel Dea <sdea@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: Re: Information for 5th dist commish

I will send you the second email after class tonight. I need to scan them first.

Thanks,

Lloyd Carder II

From: Rosie Ruiz <<u>rruiz@planning.lacounty.qov</u>> To: Lloyd & Nancy Carder <<u>carderfam@yahoo.com</u>> Cc: Richard Claghorn <<u>rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov</u>>; Samuel Dea <<u>sdea@planning.lacounty.gov</u>> Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:37 PM Subject: RE: Information for 5th dist commish

Mr. Carder, Your email will be sent to the Regional Planning Commission. Thank you.

1

#### **ROSIE O. RUIZ | Commission Services** Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning 213.974.6409 | http://planning.lacounty.gov | rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.

From: Lloyd & Nancy Carder [mailto:carderfam@yahoo.com] Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:31 PM To: Rosie Ruiz <<u>rruiz@planning.lacounty.gov</u>> Subject: Information for 5th dist commish

Please forward this to Mr Pat Modugno and offer my sadness that I had so much trouble getting these to him. I have 3 more maps of the Five Point project that I have digitized but will send next.

Dear Mr. Pat Modugno

These are the proximity maps of the landfill for the local schools and businesses you asked me for. From map 3 we can see how close the Five Point project and schools will be.

The community still has not been able to get true third party gas and fume analysis done. They have been blocked 2 times I know of but they are saying more. The 2 by them selves will be enough to show what is needed legally.

I approved this project as a past councilman with full knowledge of the closing agreement and that is the reason I was re-elected by the residents of my region. I would like to come in and discuss this with you maybe even near home?

My contact information to him is:

Lloyd Carder II President Castaic Area Town Council C 661.600.2134 <u>carderfam@yahoo.com</u> <u>lloyd@pacificautomatedwelding.com</u>

From: Sent: To: Subject: Richard Claghorn Wednesday, March 29, 2017 2:01 PM 'Anne marie Whalley'; Richard Claghorn Chiquita Canyon Landfill Final EIR

Hello Anne Marie,

I've included a link below to the Final EIR and other materials for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

http://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/project\_no\_r2004\_00559\_5\_conditional\_use\_permit\_2004\_00042\_chiquita\_ca\_nyon\_/

1

The Final EIR documents are listed under the heading "Master Plan Revisions".

Richard Claghorn Principal Regional Planning Assistant Zoning Permits North Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1348 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Phone: 213-974-6443

From:Richard ClaghornSent:Wednesday, March 29, 2017 2:42 PMTo:'Anne marie Whalley'Subject:RE: Bonjour againAttachments:092916\_ANNE\_MARIE\_WHALLEY\_WAIVER\_CHIQUITA\_CANYON.pdf; Whalley letter<br/>9-18-16.pdf

#### Hello Anne Marie,

Are you referring to the attached letter that you wrote dated 9/18/16? Our department did prepare a response to the letter, dated 9/29/16, which is attached. I think the reason it wasn't included with the comment letters in the Final EIR is because it dealt with the Clean Hands Waiver rather than the EIR, it was written before the release of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR (PRDEIR) released 11/9/16, and also because it was already responded to. We can include your letter and the response letter as part of the hearing package that the Regional Planning Commission receives if you like. If you still have questions about it, please let me know. Thanks.

#### **Richard Claghorn**

Principal Regional Planning Assistant Zoning Permits North Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1348 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Phone: 213-974-6443

From: Anne marie Whalley [mailto:poupettelafleur@yahoo.com] Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 2:24 PM To: Richard Claghorn <rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: Bonjour again

Dear Richard:

I have not seen my letter addressed for this project. You told me that the County would answer my questions. My letter should have been scanned, because I sent it by mail. Could you let me know why this did not happen? Thank you Richard. I wish you a good day. Anne Marie Whalley

## September 18, 2016

To: Supervisor Hilda Solis Supervisor Sheila Kuehl Supervisor Mark Ridley Thomas Supervisor Don Knabe Supervisor Michael Antonovich Executive office Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors 500 W. Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

To: Mr. Richard Bruckner Director Department of Regional Planning County of Los Angeles 320 West Temple Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, California, 90012

Re: Objection to the Waiver for Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Please enter this letter into the Admistrative Record for CUP Project No. R2004-00559-(5) SCH No. 2005081071

Dear Supervisors: Dear Mr. Richard Bruckner:

I tried to analyze your letter sent to Chiquita Canyon on March 17, 2016 and because I love sociology, my letter to you is written with comments and questions.

From your letter Mr. Richard Bruckner addressed to Chiquita Canyon on March 17. 2016:

"I am in receipt .... new Conditional Use Permit (CUP)."

I looked at Section 22.04.110

"Section 22.04.110 No application required pursuant to this Title shall be accepted, is being maintained or operated in violation of any applicable provision of this Title, or any condition of approval of a land used permit. This provision applies to the operation of lands uses only, and does not conform to development standards. Where in his sole discretion the Director, whose determination shall be final, determines that the use in question is essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare, this provision shall not apply."

To the public convenience or welfare: Have you asked the public if they would agree with your decision to send a waiver to authorize Chiquita Canyon landfill to now accept 29.4 million of tons of waste compared to the 23 million of tons reached in the contract signed in 1997? Only an <u>analyzed</u> report has been made from the County before the Board of Supervisors accepted the CUP No 89-081 with 23 million tons or the year 2019 which ever comes first. If the Board of Supervisors approved the CUP No 89-081, it was, I assume, because our supervisors cared for the health and welfare of Val Verde residents, and other present and future residents of the Santa CLarita Valley.

The closure of the landfill is essential and desirable for our welfare for many good reasons. In Santa Clarita, we have Chiquita Canyon Landfill on one side, and Sunshine landfill on the other side. We also fought vehemently to not allow the proposed Elsemere Canyon Landfill added in our backyard for good reason. These resons include our welfare which is more important than our convenience. The same principles remain for expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill contract and the conditions of approval. Morever the Board of Supervisors has rejected the analysis of more than 23 million tons in the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. That's why we have the CUP No 89-081 that says the landfill will close after reaching 23 million tons of trash or the year 2019 whichever comes first.

The letter of the landfill operator bothers me. He cites that "all other conditions of approval of the current conditional use permit, including daily and weekly tonnage limits and a required closure date of November 24, 2019 would continue to apply to the landfill operation in the interim time period."

Mr Bruckner, could you let me know where in the CUP No 89-081 adopted by the Board of Supervisors, I can find the date November 24, 2019 without exceeding the 23 million tons?

Then, in his letter to you, the owner or operator of the landfill reiterates that the County's unincorporated communities have already achieved and surpassed California's 50% waste diversion mandate. (What about the City of Los Angeles and other incorporated cities?)

Also, the owner or the operator of the landfill writes that "The County's 2013 Annual report on the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan assumed and relied upon the continued operation of Chiquita Canyon Landfill for the next three years, with remaining capacity of 2, 943, 559 tons of waste." It seems the landfill in 2013 was filled to within 12% of the maximum 23 million tons. Based on that, by 2016 the 23 million tonnage figure would be reached, and Chiquita's continued operation beyond that would exceed the mandate of CUP No 89-081 established.

The owner or the operator of the landfill in his letter dated November 2015, says it all "Current projections for the landfill suggest that the overall capacity limitation of 23 million tons will be reached <u>earlier</u> than the projections assumed in the County's 2013 Annual Report, and potentially also before the new requested and necessary environmental review and public hearings for a new conditional use permit request can be completed."

I also understand that the owner or operator of the landfill has indicated that the original CUP No 89-081 envelope dimensions can still accept more trash due to efficiencies applied in the employed "processes". The operator however wishes to expand the approved tonnage and the envelope of the landfill, (see CUP application No 2004-00042.). To achieve his goal of expansion, he requested a waiver to continue beyond the approved 23 million tons. He knows how to conduct business by applying the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance Section 22.04.110 to obtain an interim waiver, but, I can read between the lines as to where he is going, he ultimately wants to prolong Chiquita Canyon Landfill operations.

The 1997 signed permit and conditions of approval signed it too well:

Condition 9g says: "Nothing in this condition shall permit the maximum tonnage of 23 million tons to be increased"

Condition 46 reads: "The maximum total capacity of the landfill shall be 23 million tons."

Condition 44 says" "The landfill operator shall comply with the agreement made with the community, including providing residents with all notice and reports on landfill. This condition also states that the county will not enforce The community contract. I understnad this, but the County sould enforce its conditions.

#### My questions are:

How many tons were in the landfill when Mr. Dean wrote the letter asking for a waiver?

How many tons are in the landfill as of today?

How many tons were there when the Landfill Operator received your letter? And, how many tons have been diverted to the landfill since 2013?

I know your title of Director entitles you to sign a waiver if per Section 22.04.110. Too many questions are on the line, and even if your decision to sign the waiver is appropriate or not, We the People should be included and allowed to participate in this matter of enlarging or continuating the use of Chiquita Canyon Landfill operations.

### 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

"The landfill filed and Department of Regional Planning.... with a defined disposal "envelope."

The landfill operator is now seeking to expand the capacity of the landfill by requesting the expansion of the horizontal and vertical "envelope" in the CUP No 2004-00042 for a while now, but it awaits completion of an EIR report to be completed and submitted. Mr. Bruckner, you understand that Chiquita Canyon Landfill had a permit and conditions signed in 1997, because it was accepted as is by the Board of Supervisors, as well as the County and it says 23 million tons or the year 2019, whichever comes first.

Your decision to sign the temporary waiver when currently processing the application No 2004-00042 does certainly buy time for the County and the landfill operator to continue operations beyond the CUP No 89-081 limit of 23 million tons while the new requested CUP No 2004-00042 process is being reviewed.

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:

"Your letter states .... Section 22.04.110 be waived."

We, citizens, have strived to reduce waste and succeeded in helping with these problems. Just as our government asked us to save water, we have been diligent, and also reduced our waste as requested.

You mention that the landfill operator indicated that closure of the landfill during the processing of the current CUP requested would result in hardship to waste haulers and local communities, including price increases. Maybe it will be wise to include and ask the residents of Val Verde, and nearby communities served from the landfill if they would rather accept a price increase based on least cost, most sensible solutions to hauling trash elsewhere than Chiquita Canyon Landfill to other landfill facilities. Chiquita, I have been told, has been operational since 1972 (about 45 years) until now. It has served Los Angeles and environs well during this time. It has had it's expansions, but so has local development and populations which are quickly closing in on Chiquita. It has served its purpose, and will become now a liability in the near future. Maybe given a little time, it can become an asset to this local community by turning it into a park setting, a recreational area, or other creative endeavors. Santa Clarita is growing, and is now the third largest city in Los Angeles County. Maybe it is time to shut-down Chiquita Canyon Landfill forever, and let it becaome a new use that will enhance the future of the area.

#### Section 22.04.110

"However, this same section provides that the prohibition may be waived "[w]here in his sole discretion the director, whose determination shall be final, determines that the use in question is consistent with the objectives, goals, and policies of the General Plan, or that the continuation of said use is essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare..."

As I said my "convenience and welfare" would include the landfill closing in November 2016. Not only for the smell, and the air quality, but I am ready to pay more to have the waste disposed in another way than in Chiquita Canyon Landfill. That's my choice, and the choice of many other people.

It would have been better maybe considering that the County did not find from 1997 to 2016 a way to dispose of the waste other than Chiquita Canyon Landfill, to have said "NO" to the landfill operator, and meanwhile begin approving another option to take care of the waste in a timely manner. 19 years should have been a long enough time to find alternatives to a landfill.

My question is: Why has the County not found alternatives to the Chiquita Canyon Landfill in 19 years?

### 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:

"We have reviewed.... and grant a <u>limited</u> waiver request as set forth more fully below." Why was community not been made aware of the waiver request before you signed it?

The Chiquita Canyon Landfill permit calls for closure at 23 million tons. The County <u>analyzed</u> more tonnage and change of the envelope during the EIR of Chiquita Canyon Landfill in 1997, and nevertheless the Board of Supervisors voted for the tonnage and the envelope cited in the CUP No 89-801. Analysis was not a permit.

My question is: Where can I find the FEIR allowing more than 23 million tons in Chiquita Canyon Landfill?

# STATUS OF CURRENT CUP APPLICATION

"Based on projections and estimate at this time ....would not have yet concluded." Again the CUP has no reference number. I would like to know if there is another CUP other than CUP No 2004-00042 circulating somewhere.

We understand from waste disposal information ....

"The landfill will reach 23 million tons of capacity in November 2016 (sooner or later.)"

My observation is: So, the landfill should close immediately, because there is no other alternative to the conditions of approval unless the Director decides otherwise, and he has decided to keep the landfill open without asking the community of Val Verde and Santa Clarita, and with no provisions for an alternative to the landfill since the year 1997 other than expansion,

"With respect to the landfill's current CUP application (CUP No 2004-00042), .... this public hearing/appeal process may not conclude before the landfill reaches 23 millions tons of capacity."

The last two sentences are important, but ambiguous. "before the landfill reaches 23 million tons of capacity."

My question is: So, does that mean that, We the people shall be heard before the expansion of tonnage even if you, Mr. Bruckner, signed the waiver?

## ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

"In connection with .... 29.4 million tons of waste disposal"

The draft environmental impact report (DEIR) has been prepared in connection in 1997.

My questions are: Was the County at that time already counting on a additional tonnage and the envelope expansion of the landfill to increase the landfill at its utmost capacity?

What exactly is the final utmost capacity envisioned for forcing permanent closure? Are you ready to sign a second waiver before July 2017 if there has been no other alternative found for the disposal of the waste, and the public hearings as well as the Supervisors hearing have not been completed to that date?

"Ultimately, The Board of Supervisors elected to limit .... as reflected in CUP No 89-801."

The Board ultimately approved the Board of Supervisors Preferred Alternative, as reflected in CUP No 89-801.

Two Boards have approved the Preferred Alternative of 23 million tons. My question is: Why sign a waiver when two entities approved a permit and conditions of approval in 1997 limiting the trash to 23 million tons?

"The Addendum prepared in connection with your request .... the Board of Supervisors

Preferred Alternative."

My question is: Why would we give authorization to continue a business when the approvedpermit says one thing, and the landfill's operator is reaching for more capacity and larger footprint? (See CUP 2004-00042). Is it to gain more time to find the County in an impasse, and thn inevitably accept the CUP 2004-00042 which will allow the landfill to add more tonnage and envelope?

"As explained in the Addendum, the landfill .... have occurred or are present here." The FEIR (final environmental impact report).

My questions are: If the Addendum appropriately <u>updates</u> the analysis of the DEIR with the FEIR, does that mean that the impacts of the DEIR with the FEIR are <u>now</u> different than they were in the 1997 permit? If yes, why not have public hearings regarding those changes?

"On a temporary basis during the current CUP application process"

I assume that the CUP is No 2004-00042. Correct?

It seems to me that the people working at the County should respond to the application immediately, and look for a diversion of the waste somewhere else than Chiquita Canyon Landfill for the CUP No 89-081 gives the date 2019 or 23 million tons, which is first to be accomplished.

INTERIM CONTINUATION OF LANDFILL OPERATIONS IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN:

"We find that the interim ....with General Plan Policy PS/F 5.1"

"The landfill serves the Santa Clarita Valley and surroundings communities."

The landfill's letter stipulates that it serves 60 communities. So, could I have a list of these communities with the percentage of waste from each city in Chiquita Canyon Landfill?

It seems to me that the City of Los Angeles puts a large percentage of waste in the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, and why has the County not found a way to divert the waste of these communities (including Santa Clarita) a long time ago?

"If the landfill is forced to close during the process of CUP No.2004-00042."

We want it to close now that 23 million tons of waste has been deposited there. That's what the 1997 permit says. We understand that the diversion of the waste could cost more to us, taxpayers. The increase would not have happened if the County would have found a way to take care of its constituents a long time ago. It has taken too long for the operator/owner of Chiquita Canyon Landfill to come up with the EIR regarding the expansion in tonnage and envelope of the landfill.

"Except with respect for the 23 million tons maximum set forth in the CUP No 89-081."

This would change the DEIR and FEIR.

"The Addendum appropriately <u>updated</u> the analysis of the DEIR and FEIR for the project with respect to the current project."

So, why the need to update if everything stays the same? I assume that the addendum is based on the analysis made before CUP No 89-801 had been approved. Again, if the two Boards have voted for CUP No 89-801 there were conditions of air quality, or other impacts different from the analysis that would be made for more tonnage and expansion of the footprint of the landfill.

So, why not keep the landfill the way it is and now that it has reached 23 million tons, close it?

"Overall, closure of the landfill during the processing of CUP No 2004-00042 will result in inefficiencies in the County's waste management system, which is inconsistent with General Plan Policy PS/F 5.1"

In those past 19 years, researching and developing a second plan should have been put into place to dispose of the waste other than in Chiquita Canyon Landfill knowing that the permit would end with 23 million tons or the year 2019 which comes first. That seems to me improper and not really intended to stop at the 23 million of tons disposed in the landfill.

"Except with respect of the 23 million ton maximum set forth in that CUP." (No 89-081).

# "INTERIM CONTINUATION OF LANDFILL OPERATIONS SERVES THE PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND WELFARE"

Have we asked the Val Verde residents what they think of an expansion of tonnage in the landfill? What is the impact to those residents with an existing landfill next to their doors? Is their welfare considered by the County? What about the people in Santa Clarita? A landfill is convenient for the County for its management of the waste, but detrimental to the health and welfare to its neighbors.

#### "TERMS OF THIS WAIVER"

"The Department is charged with balancing .... to be met."

"Not only hardships which may accrue to the landfill operator"

Landfill operators are in a business that people usually don't intend to use forever. Look at all the landfills closing in the nation. Waste Connection is a multi billion dollars business. If Chiquita Canyon Landfill closes, it's up to the owner of the landfill to find another location to conduct business. When I was working at the time of the recession, I could not find clients to make my business adequate enough to pay my mortgage, etc. I went out to find temporary jobs to survive, and my family and I did survived the recession. The landfill operator should do the same, or change his business.

"If the landfill should be forced to close during the processing of CUP No 2004-00042"

There are a number of people who want the closing of the landfill in the terms of CUP No 89-081. It's up to the County to find another location for the waste. The County had 19 years to do so. The landfill operator is asking for a new CUP approval and intends to take time to tell people about it. Meanwhile, with the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance Section 22.04.110., the landfill operator or owner, plays a game. Everyone in your department understands that. We understand it too.

"But also with ensuring that interim operation of the landfill results in minimal impacts to the surrounding Val Verde community".

Is the Val Verde community aware of the impacts however minimal? Suing a landfill owner is difficult. We will need lawyers to compete against a 3 billion dollar business. The process will become costly for all (time and money).

"We believe the operating conditions of CUP No 89-081 strike the appropriate balance between landfill operations and the local community"

As I said before, the expiration of the CUP No 89-081 should end with 23 million tons. It is further written that "further believe some additional terms and limitations are necessary to maintain this balance and to ensure the above General Plan and public convenience and welfare findings continue to be met." The County may find reasons necessary to keep the landfill open, but there will be great opposition. It'll not be agreeable to continue the life of the landfill due to new impacts, air quality, etc. So, it seems that the County has taken upon itself to breach a contract between the people of Val Verde and the landfill operator, as well as a breach of the permit approved by the Board Of Supervisors in 1997.

"Therefore, the Department is granting you a limited waiver, subject to the following: ...." "unless and until : (a) the landfill reaches its 23 million ton capacity."

One more time, the landfill operator has explained that the 23 million tons contract would be achieved soon (letter dated November 2015). I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW MANY TONS WERE AVAILABLE ON NOVEMBER 2015, AND HOW MANY TONS HAVE BEEN DUMPED SINCE THAT DATE IN THE LANDFILL?

"shall not preclude DRP from processing the pending CUP application despite the landfill's accepting of waste in excess of the 23 million ton maximum set forth in Conditions Nos. 9 (g) and 46 contained in CUP No 89-081, provided the applicant/landfill operator complies with all of the following terms and conditions:

(b) Except with respect to the 23 million ton maximum set forth in Conditions No 9(g) and 46 of CUP No 89-081 ...."

It is not said how long the landfill operator would be able to accept waste from the County communities or communities outside of the County. Why is that? "(c) and in no event shall exceed 29.4 million tons as <u>analyzed</u> in the FEIR for CUP No 89-081;"

This was an <u>analysis</u> rejected by the Board of Supervisors. An analysis is not an approved permit. Why would the Regional Planning Department defeat the permit approved by the Board of Supervisors with your waiver on March 17, 2016 that allowed yhse landfill to have an additional 6.4 million in excess from the PUC No 89-081?

"(d) which would result in a new environmental impact or a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact previously identified in the FEIR for CUP No 89-081."

The 29.4 million tons have not been authorized for CUP No 89-081. Only an analysis report was been made with no vote or notice to authorize this. This alone to me

does not justify the 6.4 million of surplus waste in the landfill. With more trash accumulated there are impacts, and the public should be made aware of them.

"(d) The applicant/landfill operator must cooperate fully and expeditiously with the .... Department staff."

CUP No 2004-00042 asks for a change in tonnage and envelope of the landfill. This negates CUP No 89-081 which says that the landfill shall close at 23 million tons or the year 2019 or which ever comes first. I know I repeat myself, but when the County takes time to evaluate a new CUP, we taxpayers pay for the time of the employees of the County. It would make sense for the County to develop a new plan right away, instead of expaning the landfill. A plan for alternatives or closure should have been put in place over the last 19 years.

"(e) The applicant/landfill operator and"

I would like to know if the landfill operator accepted more than 23 million tons before he received your waiver.

## "3 THIS WAIVER SHALL CEASE TO BE EFFECTIVE FOR ANY PURPOSES UPON THE EARLIER OF THE FOLLOWING:

(a) the pending CUP application (CUP No 2004-00042) is withdrawn, approved, or denied, ....or,"

So, we do not know how many tons will be added in the landfill until the CUP is withdrawn, approved or denied. I know that you spoke earlier of 29 million tons. I suppose that the difference between 29.4 million and 23 million of tons is for the continuation of the landfill within the envelope of CUP No 89-081. Am I right? Again, the 29 million of tons reflected an analysis of a concept from the County before the CUP No 89-081 was adopted. I understand that this could be an alternative for the County to dispose of the waste, but again an analysis is not an approved permit, a signed contract or a condition of approval. Is there a maximum end date for submission of the required new EIR to allow CUP 2004-00042) to be revised by the public?

I'd like to know how many tons of waste maximum the landfill can accept. Is it written in the draft of the CUP 2004-00042? Because I understand that the envelope will change as well as the tonnage. So, could you give me this number, and the date the landfill should close with the CUP 2004-00042? We, the People, need to be aware before the expansion of the landfill. We already are very concerned with the new unprecededented waiver for 29 million tons. It seems that Chiquita Canyon landfill is an ongoing debate, and it might be necessary to halt its use as soon as possible, with due respect to the welfare of the concerned communities. The waiver can be revoked, and it should be for the citizens of Los Angeles County welfare. Our welfare is important because we did not support the expansion of the landfill, nor has the Board of Supervisors.

Dear Supervisors,

Dear Mr. Bruckner,

I hope to have answers to my comments and questions. In the end, we must be concerned with the decision of Mr. Bruckner, and ask for verifications.

Anne Marie Whalley Resident of Santa Clarita 18724 Nathan Hill Rd, Santa Clarita, CA 91351 جا الم من المنابين (English is my second language, but I hope that you will understand my comments

.

and questions.) If you have any questions, please let me know.

A . . .



Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



Richard J. Bruckner Director

September 29, 2016

Mrs. Anne Marie Whalley 18724 Nathan Hill Road Santa Clarita, CA 91351

Dear Ms. Whalley:

## WAIVER FOR CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Thank you for your recent correspondence dated September 18, 2016, regarding the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. As you are aware, the applicant for the pending Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 200400042, Project No. R2004-00559 for the continued operation and expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill, requested a waiver to allow the landfill to remain open while the pending CUP is in process, even though the tonnage limit was expected to surpass the limit established by the current CUP 89-081. Section 22.04.110 of the Los Angeles County Code authorizes the Regional Planning Director to grant a waiver to said section if he determines that the use is essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare.

Due to the unique circumstances in this case, the community's need for a reliable location to safely and responsibly dispose of waste, the potentially significant problems which would result from an immediate closure of the landfill, and after consultation with other County departments determined that it was in the best interest of the community for the landfill to remain open at this time. This action is a temporary measure to avoid a disruption in waste disposal service as the pending CUP goes through the public hearing process. The waiver ceases to have any effect when a final action is taken to approve or deny the CUP, the CUP is withdrawn, or if the waiver is revoked. The waiver expires on July 31, 2017, even if a final action on the CUP has still not occurred by that time.

According to the applicant's Biennial Report for 2015 submitted on December 11, 2015, the cumulative amount of waste disposed at the landfill was 21,786,803 tons as of July 31, 2015. The landfill operator provides monthly tonnage load reports to the Department of Public Works. These reports are available on the Val Verde Community Advisory Committee website (<u>www.valverdecac.com/landfill.php</u>) for the period from January 2008 through July 2016. You can determine the cumulative amount of waste disposed for any given date during this time period by using the total from the 2015 Biennial report for July 31, 2015, and adding or subtracting from this number the total tons disposed for each month from the tonnage load reports.

The County is working to bring the pending CUP to a public hearing before the RPC at the earliest possible date. Prior to the hearing for the CUP, a public hearing will also be held in the community by a Hearing Examiner for the project's Draft Environmental Impact Report

Anne Marie Whalley September 29, 2016 Page 2

(DEIR). Six chapters of the existing DEIR from 2014 (Introduction, Project Description, Biological Resources, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, and Project Alternatives) are being revised and are to be recirculated. The revised chapters are expected to be ready for public release in November 2016, and the Hearing Examiner meeting in the community is tentatively planned for December 2016. The meeting location and date have not yet been confirmed. Written comments on the revised chapters of the DEIR may also be submitted up to 60 days after the public release of the revised chapters of the DEIR.

The Regional Planning Commission public hearing in the community for the CUP is tentatively proposed for early March 2017. This public hearing will provide members of the public with the opportunity to participate in the process and to have their voices heard.

In order to view the current DEIR from 2014 and related documents, you may visit the Department of Regional Planning website at the following link: <u>planning.lacounty.gov/case</u>. You may access this information by entering the Project Number R2004-00559 into the search field. The recirculated DEIR chapters will be posted at this same location when the documents are ready for release, and the documents related to the CUP will also be posted here later.

We appreciate your concerns about the project and welcome your participation in the process. Your name has been added to our courtesy list for the project, so you will be included on the mailing list when notices are sent for the public hearings. I hope that this information is useful to you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Richard Claghorn at (213) 974-6443 or <u>rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov</u>. Our office hours are Monday through Thursday, 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

moluer Richard J. Bruckner Director

RJB:SA:RG:Im

c: Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich (Edel Vizcarra), Supervisor Hilda Solis, Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Supervisor Don Knabe

092916\_ANNE\_MARIE\_WHALLEY\_WAIVER\_CHIQUITA\_CANYON

From: Sent: To: Subject: Anne marie Whalley <poupettelafleur@yahoo.com> Wednesday, March 29, 2017 2:50 PM Richard Claghorn my letter

Yes, it is the letter. I never received any answer from it. Yes, I'd like to have it in the EIR with the answers, and a copy for my file. Thank you Richard Anne Marie Whalley

From: Sent: To: Subject: Marilyn Pisa <mpisa16@gmail.com> Thursday, March 30, 2017 6:08 AM Richard Claghorn Chiquita land fill expansion

I know that we need land fills but as a resident if Santa Clarita, I wonder why new dump locations gave not been identified. Expanding the Chiquita Landfill will have a negative impact on the Santa Clarita Valley air quality and traffic.

Find a new dump location and close Chiquita

Marilyn Pisa 26116 GalvezCt. Valencia, Ca 91355

From: Sent: To: Subject: Jill Breznican <jill.breznican@gmail.com> Friday, March 31, 2017 12:51 PM Richard Claghorn Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion

Dear Mr. Claghorn,

My husband and I moved to the Santa Clarita Valley three years ago from Los Angeles. As parents of two young children we were drawn to Valencia's charming neighborhoods, Gold Ribbon schools, beautiful green parks, and miles of natural hiking trails and secure bike paths. Our neighbors have become fast friends and local activities with our daughter's Girl Scout troop have allowed us to further explore the possibilities of our vibrant community. In other words, we're invested in continuing to make the Santa Clarita Valley a desirable place to live for other young families.

Expanding the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, just five miles away, stands in opposition to that future. Just ask the residents in nearby Val Verde, who have suffered for years from debilitating headaches and nausea due to their close proximity to the dump's toxic odors. Adding 12,000 metric tons of solid waste a day only increases the threat of dangerous health and environmental risks to the Val Verde, Castaic, and surrounding communities.

Unfortunately, I don't have specific solutions to offer on where the excess trash should go instead. What I offer is simply a mother's plea to move the waste farther away from densely inhabited urban areas. Our community's children deserve a clean and healthy environment to thrive in.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jill Breznican Valencia, CA 91354

From: Sent: To: Subject: Lizete O'Connor lizetern2016@yahoo.com> Friday, March 31, 2017 12:54 PM DRP LDCC; Richard Claghorn Chiquita Canyon Landfill

To whom it may concern:

I oppose expanding the Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

This dump is located too close to vulnerable populations such as schools with young children.

This dump will worsen already bad air quality for the entire Santa Clarita Valley.

This dump will worsen the traffic on the I-5 and on the 405 freeway.

This dump is located too close to an active fault line. It threatens our groundwater.

It is unfair to further burden our residents when other options like Mesquite Landfill are available.

Constituent health and environmental hazards should not be ignored due to financial incentives.

Thank you for your concerns,

Lizete O'Connor

From: Sent: To: Subject: Jim Herbert <jimtranspo@gmail.com> Saturday, April 01, 2017 11:52 AM Richard Claghorn NO to expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

I want to say loud and clear that "*I oppose expanding the Chiquita Canyon Landfill!*" I have lived in Santa Clarita, CA (Santa Clarita Valley) since 1978. I grew up here. Now my kids are going up here. I believe the citizens of Santa Clarita have done their part with the disposal of trash. The Chiquita Canyon Landfill is due to close and had promised to close. It needs to close on schedule. Please include my comments in your Administrative Records. Thank you.

Santa Clarita Resident,

Dale Herbert II Sent from my iPhone

From: Sent: To: Subject: DRP LDCC Monday, April 03, 2017 7:38 AM Richard Claghorn; Samuel Dea FW: STOP the Expansion!!!

FYI

Thank you,

Alice Wong, AICP Principal Planner Land Development Coordinating Center Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1360 Los Angeles, CA 90012 http://planning.lacounty.gov/

Department Front Counter Hours: M, Tu, Th 7:30am-5:30pm & W 8:30am-5:30pm Closed every Friday



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, attorney work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender of this email immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and immediately destroy this message, including any attachments.

From: Jeanne McNiff [mailto:play2learnandgrow@gmail.com] Sent: Saturday, April 01, 2017 10:31 AM To: DRP LDCC <D4@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: STOP the Expansion!!!

I oppose expanding the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Please consider the health and safety of children, families, and the community. It is unfair to burden communities (for financial prowess) with health hazards, poor air quality, and other hinderances when other landfill options are available. I hope you consider other options and hear the voices of community members and supporters, like myself. Thank You, Jeanne McNiff-Hendzlik

| From:    | Dee Porter <herbert1@sbcglobal.net></herbert1@sbcglobal.net> |
|----------|--|
| Sent:    | Monday, April 03, 2017 8:50 AM                               |
| То:      | Rosie Ruiz; Richard Claghorn                                 |
| Subject: | Chiquita Canyon Landfill                                     |

Dear LA County Regional Planning Commissioners:

I am writing to express my personal opposition for Chiquita Canyon Landfill's FEIR for The Master Plan Revision. This is an inadequate and unnecessary plan for the landfill.

As a resident, I recognize that Chiquita Canyon has been too close to nearby communities for more than four decades, and plays a big role in the decline of air quality of the Santa Clarita Valley. This is especially important considering that its expansion would make the air quality and traffic in the SCV much worse, all while communities continue to be built nearby.

In looking at the DEIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon has not carefully considered the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. The report states that daily emissions of PM 2.5 (dust particles) from construction and operation would *exceed the Air Quality Management District threshold* and that even with additional mitigation, PM 2.5 would *"remain potentially significant and unavoidable."* (ES.6.8, Air Quality).

Aside from the issues surrounding the PM 2.5 levels, there is no data for Hydrogen Sulfide and Vinyl Chloride levels for the landfill in the report. Hydrogen Sulfide odor above 30 ppm is described as sweet or sickeningly sweet often the smell residents have reported smelling from the landfill site. At your 2014 hearing on the expansion residents testified to having symptoms of Hydrogen Sulfide poisoning including nausea, headaches, burning eyes and airway problems. One resident in his testimony described the symptoms as "It's like someone's choking me." Until there is more data on air quality and health conditions in Val Verde and surrounding areas this project must not be approved.

The landfill is also ignoring their contract with the nearby community of Val Verde – something I feel is unacceptable, and sets further precedent for broken promises to the SCV, much to the ongoing frustration of area residents.

Over the years, Chiquita Canyon has been caught taking in sludge (which is not permitted there), in addition to numerous violations in regard to its smell. This reflects the site's inability to manage itself at its current size, much less at double its size.

The environmental report also states "...cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase cancer risk by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a *significant cumulative impact*." The cancer risk is at 15 which is 5 above the threshold. (11.9.2.3, Health Impacts) I urge the Commission to look forward to a different waste plan to help protect the citizens of the Santa Clarita Valley by considering the amount of people that are poised to live in its wake, as well as the 13,000 children that currently attend school as close as 0.8 miles away from the project.

As a result, I am adamantly opposed to the findings of the FEIR and the Master Plan Revision, and recommend finding a new way. Please close Chiquita Landfill as scheduled back in 1997.

Sincerely, Mardeen Porter - Val Verde, CA 91384

| From:<br>Sent: | Malcolm Blue <scvmjb@att.net><br/>Monday, April 03, 2017 11:32 AM</scvmjb@att.net> |
|----------------|--|
| To:            | Rosie Ruiz   |
| Cc:            | Richard Claghorn   |

Chiquita Opposition Letter for DRP Commissioners Dear LA County Regional Planning Commissioners:

I am writing to express my personal opposition for Chiquita Canyon Landfill's FEIR for The Master Plan Revision. This is an inadequate and unnecessary plan for the landfill.

As a resident, I recognize that Chiquita Canyon has been too close to nearby communities for more than four decades, and plays a big role in the decline of air quality of the Santa Clarita Valley. This is especially important considering that its expansion would make the air quality and traffic in the SCV much worse, all while communities continue to be built nearby.

In looking at the DEIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon has not carefully considered the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. The report states that daily emissions of PM2.5 (dust particles) from construction and operation would exceed the Air Quality Management District threshold and that even with additional mitigation, PM2.5 would "remain potentially significant and unavoidable." (ES.6.8, Air Quality).

Aside from the issues surrounding the PM2.5 levels, there is no local data for Hydrogen Sulfide and Vinyl Chloride levels for the landfill in the report. Hydrogen Sulfide odor above 30 ppm is described as sweet or sickeningly sweet often the smell residents have reported smelling from the landfill site

[https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/hydrogensulfide/hazards.html]. At your 2014 hearing on the expansion residents testified to having symptoms of Hydrogen Sulfide poisoning including nausea, headaches, burning eyes and airway problems. One resident in his testimony described the symptoms as "It's like someone's choking me." Until there is more data on air quality and health conditions in Val Verde and surrounding areas this project must not be approved.

The landfill is also ignoring their contract with the nearby community of Val Verde – something I feel is unacceptable, and sets further precedent for broken promises to the SCV, much to the ongoing frustration of area residents. Over the years, Chiquita Canyon has been caught taking in sludge (which is not permitted there), in addition to numerous violations in regard to its smell. This reflects the site's inability to manage itself at its current size, much less at double its size.

The environmental report also states "...cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase cancer risk by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a significant cumulative impact." The cancer risk is at 15 which is 5 above the threshold. (11.9.2.3, Health Impacts) I urge the Commission to look forward to a different waste plan to help protect the citizens of the Santa Clarita Valley by considering the amount of people that are poised to live in its wake, as well as the 13,000 children that currently attend school as close as 0.8 miles away from the project.

As a result, I am adamantly opposed to the findings of the FEIR and the Master Plan Revision, and recommend finding a new way. Please close Chiquita Landfill as scheduled back in 1997.

This is more than a legal decision. It is a moral choice with which you are charged.

Sincerely, Malcolm J. Blue 26432 Marsala Drive Valencia, CA 91355

1

| From:        | Paul Simmonds <simmonds5@dslextreme.com></simmonds5@dslextreme.com>    |
|--------------|--|
| Sent:        | Monday, April 03, 2017 12:34 PM  |
| То:          | Rosie Ruiz   |
| Cc:          | Richard Claghorn; Kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; nippolito@bos.lacounty.gov |
| Subject:     | Chiquita Landfill Expansion.   |
| Attachments: | Landfill031.pdf  |

Rosie Ruiz, County Planning Commission, County Board of Supervisors:

Thank you for taking the time today to understand the full impact of this proposed landfill expansion. I am pleading with you, the Planning Commission, the County Board of Supervisors and all elected City, County and State officials to look at the total implications and the effects of on the quality of my life and the lives of so many in Santa Clarita, Castaic and Val Verde residents. I am a 25 year resident of this community, I can no longer spend much time outside in my own community due to the stench and the air quality. I take care of my 90 year old mother who can no longer do the one thing that she enjoys is to just simply sit outside.

My husband and I moved to Val Verde 25 years ago because we enjoyed the slow pace and the country atmosphere. We have both served on our Val Verde Community Association and I currently serve as a member of the Val Verde Community Advisory Committee. My husband contributed to the writing of by-laws for the Community Benefits Funding Committee. These last few years that we have resided in our community have been destroyed by the constant stench from the landfill. We have evidence that the landfill has broken their contractual agreement of 1997 made with our community by taking in sludge and toxic chemicals. My husband, Paul Simmonds, worked long and hard on the original negation team with the Landfill and the community of Val Verde. We stayed in this community because of that agreement. We trusted our family was going to be safe but now understand the constant harm we were subjected to. We have no alternative at this point but to file a class action against the landfill and the county if you allow them to proceed with this expansion. Is this a company you want to do business with and continue to place the county in jeopardy. This includes the predated "Clean Hands Wavier" given to the landfill when community members realized they were over tonnage.

I not only live in this community but have worked directly with many of the families in here in Castaic and Val Verde through the Los Angeles County Office of Education Head Start Program. I know many of these people are afraid to speak up, afraid of the repercussions for their actions. Many are Hispanic and live below the poverty line. We feel because of this we have a strong Civil Case. I feel it is a shame when elected officials do not protect all of their citizens, just the ones that are able to enhance their campaigns. We are aware of the elected officials in the city, county and state level that have received funds from the landfill or their advertisement firm, with a promise to vote pro-landfill, money leaves a paper trail. We know everyone who has spoken "Pro Landfill" has their hands in the landfill's pocket.

We are well aware of the monetary benefit the landfill brings to the County of Los Angeles, but what is the true cost for the health and well being of the communities of Santa Clarita, Castaic and Val Verde. You are well aware of the residents, the schools and people who work within the five mile radius that will be detrimentally impacted by the expansion (Per the DEIR) which includes air, water and soil contamination. Which includes unacceptable increased cancer risks. You know how congested the 15, 14, 405 and 126 freeways already are and to add more truck traffic to an already overly congested freeway system is irresponsible and reprehensible. You know there is a viable alternative to the this landfill for the county's waste.

I was told by some well meaning people just move. I would love to do that very thing but we, just like many of my neighbors, are not ready or able to do just that. However I fear, with great amount of evidence, that if the landfill is allowed to expand the value of my home will greatly diminish., making it truly impossible to sell or move. I fear most of what I am writing is a moot point because your actions have already displayed a pro-landfill stance i.e. the bridge on the 126 and the clean hands waiver (nothing clean about that). We know we do not have billions of dollars to offer the county. We are asking you take the morally right position and care for the residence you were elected to protect.

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has. Margaret Mead

Sincerely, Martha Simmonds

https://secure-web.cisco.com/1Zr8ySFRNb3dzAKLFLFHDpr7Su-

mXpL4YlayyBLfvPriiNfyk5j0sHcNBmlBynglBAOkeVwjyGnyt6QFEuTBons\_hlW3r\_yubfimn\_9-aFM9UtyHUPW21myQx-fys0bZyCy\_rv-SSfbq2Mr-

\_KHSxCRSILxjrvRfWaP6FTn35AalGWni\_brjdNgO3BVPeR05gnJ8\_19pOdt2uhUq2WhlMKDWKPGJkYmJXnAGwGBugmTltUd 5hTOdGXcSSgfUuMqSYS5NFXm0PgVUae-oi3NYp7fQ0lZDwvOTYOm7UfxLcWfvXUXKQacWnQ7iyUNT0RVEHG4k4Hibp3x-YQVfNpvbv7ljXYWsrHm6KaTVnHZP9cxXjYW8BXlzJVeGSEPN1WCkwYHyUKLTw7ckwfL7\_VbRi8Q/https%3A%2F%2Fwww. ourchildrenstrust.org%2Fus%2Ffederal-lawsuit%2F **Dear LA County Regional Planning Commissioners:** 

I am writing to express my personal opposition for Chiquita Canyon Landfill's FEIR for The Master Plan Revision. This is an inadequate and unnecessary plan for the landfill.

As a resident for the last 25 years, I recognize that Chiquita Canyon has been too close to nearby communities for more than four decades, and plays a big role in the decline of air quality of the Santa Clarita Valley. This is especially important considering that its expansion would make the air quality and traffic in the SCV much worse, all while communities continue to be built nearby.

In looking at the DEIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon has not carefully considered the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. The report states that daily emissions of PM2.5 (dust particles) from construction and operation would *exceed the Air Quality Management District threshold* and that even with additional mitigation, PM2.5 would *"remain potentially significant and unavoidable."* (ES.6.8, Air Quality).

Aside from the issues surrounding the PM2.5 levels, there is no data for Hydrogen Sulfide and Vinyl Chloride levels for the landfill in the report. Hydrogen Sulfide odor above 30 ppm is described as sweet or sickeningly sweet often the smell residents have reported smelling from the landfill site. At your 2014 hearing on the expansion residents testified to having symptoms of Hydrogen Sulfide poisoning including nausea, headaches, burning eyes and airway problems. One resident in his testimony described the symptoms as "It's like someone's choking me." Until there is more data on air quality and health conditions in Val Verde and surrounding areas this project must not be approved.

The landfill is also ignoring their contract with the nearby community of Val Verde – something I feel is unacceptable, and sets further precedent for broken promises to the SCV, much to the ongoing frustration of area residents. My husband, Paul Simmonds, was one of the original negotiators and was present at the signing of this contract. Many items in this contract were ignored or blatantly disregarded like taking toxic chemicals or sludge. This is a company you would want to trust with the health and well being of so many.

Over the years, Chiquita Canyon has been caught taking in sludge (which is not permitted there), in addition to numerous violations in regard to its smell. This reflects the site's inability to manage itself at its current size, much less at double its size.

The environmental report also states "...cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase cancer risk by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a *significant cumulative impact.*" The cancer risk is at 15 which is 5 above the threshold. (11.9.2.3, Health Impacts) I urge the Commission to look forward to a different waste plan to help protect the citizens of the Santa Clarita Valley by considering the amount of people that are poised to live in its wake, as well as the 13,000 children that currently attend school as close as 0.8 miles away from the project.

As a result, I am adamantly opposed to the findings of the FEIR and the Master Plan Revision, and recommend finding a new way. Please close Chiquita Landfill as scheduled back in 1997.

职

Sincerely,

Minin Semmon

| From:<br>Sent:<br>To: | Bevin Gur <bevingur@gmail.com><br/>Monday, April 03, 2017 2:50 PM<br/>Rosie Ruiz<br/>Bisbard Clochorn</bevingur@gmail.com> |
|-----------------------|--|
| Cc:                   | Richard Claghorn   |
| Subject:              | Close Chiquita Landfill!   |

Dear LA County Regional Planning Commissioners:

I am writing to express my personal opposition for Chiquita Canyon Landfill's FEIR for The Master Plan Revision. This is an inadequate and unnecessary plan for the landfill.

As a resident, I recognize that Chiquita Canyon has been too close to nearby communities for more than four decades, and plays a big role in the decline of air quality of the Santa Clarita Valley. This is especially important considering that its expansion would make the air quality and traffic in the SCV much worse, all while communities continue to be built nearby.

In looking at the DEIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon has not carefully considered the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. The report states that daily emissions of PM2.5 (dust particles) from construction and operation would *exceed the Air Quality Management District threshold* and that even with additional mitigation, PM2.5 would *"remain potentially significant and unavoidable*." (ES.6.8, Air Quality). Aside from the issues surrounding the PM2.5 levels, there is no local data for Hydrogen Sulfide and Vinyl Chloride levels for the landfill in the report. Hydrogen Sulfide odor above 30 ppm is described as sweet or sickeningly sweet often the smell residents have reported smelling from the landfill

site [https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/hydrogensulfide/hazards.html]. At your 2014 hearing on the expansion residents testified to having symptoms of Hydrogen Sulfide poisoning including nausea, headaches, burning eyes and airway problems. One resident in his testimony described the symptoms as "It's like someone's choking me." Until there is more data on air quality and health conditions in Val Verde and surrounding areas this project must not be approved.

The landfill is also ignoring their contract with the nearby community of Val Verde – something I feel is unacceptable, and sets further precedent for broken promises to the SCV, much to the ongoing frustration of area residents.

Over the years, Chiquita Canyon has been caught taking in sludge (which is not permitted there), in addition to numerous violations in regard to its smell. This reflects the site's inability to manage itself at its current size, much less at double its size.

The environmental report also states "...cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase **cancer risk** by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a *significant cumulative impact*." The cancer risk is at 15 which is 5 above the threshold. (11.9.2.3, Health Impacts) I urge the Commission to look forward to a different waste plan to help protect the citizens of the Santa Clarita Valley by considering the amount of people that are poised to live in its wake, as well as the 13,000 children that currently attend school as close as 0.8 miles away from the project. As a result, I am adamantly opposed to the findings of the FEIR and the Master Plan Revision, and recommend finding a new way. Please close Chiquita Landfill as scheduled back in 1997. Sincerely,

Bevin Gür

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Attachments: Taskforce Monday, April 03, 2017 3:03 PM Richard Claghorn Dan Lafferty; Carlos Ruiz; Bahman Hajialiakbar; mikemohajer@yahoo.com Chiquita Canyon Landfill - Task Force's Comments on the Final EIR ChiquitaCanyonLandfillTFComments.pdf



## TO: Mr. Richard Claghorn

County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning

Please see the attached letter dated April 3, 2017, from the Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/Integrated Waste Management Task Force providing comments on the Final EIR for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion Project.

If you have any questions regarding the subject matter, please contact Mr. Mike Mohajer of the Task Force at <u>MikeMohajer@yahoo.com</u> or at (909) 592-1147. For questions regarding the Task Force, please contact Ms. Kristin Keating at (626) 458-2505 or <u>kkeating@dpw.lacounty.gov</u>.

1



LOS ANGELES COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE/ INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE 900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE, ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331 P.O. BOX 1460, ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460 www.lacountyiswmtf.org

MARK PESTRELLA, CHAIR MARGARET CLARK, VICE - CHAIR

April 3, 2017

Mr. Richard Claghorn County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning Zoning Permits North Section, Room 1348 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Claghorn:

## COMMENTS ON PARTIALLY RECIRCULATED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT - SCH No. 2005081071 - CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL MASTER PLAN REVISION PROJECT NO.: R2004-00559-(5)

The Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/Integrated Waste Management Task Force (Task Force) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision, Project No. R2004-00559-(5), which was released for public review on November 9, 2016.

The proposed Project, among other things, entails increasing the permitted daily disposal tonnage from 6,000 to 12,000 tons per day; increasing the disposal footprint laterally by 143 acres; and increasing the maximum elevation by 143 feet. As indicated in the DEIR, this would extend the existing Chiquita Canyon Landfill's life by additional 24 to 38 years, depending on the amount of the daily disposal rate. The Project also provides for the development of an on-site household hazardous facility and an open mixed organics composting operation while setting-aside a portion of the subject site for possible development of a conversion technology facility, sometime in the future.

As provided by Chapter 3.67 of the Los Angeles County Code and the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939 [AB 939], as amended), the Task Force is responsible for coordinating the development of all major solid waste planning documents prepared for the County of Los Angeles and the 88 cities in Los Angeles County. Consistent with these responsibilities and ensures a coordinated, cost-effective, and environmentally-sound solid waste management system in Los Angeles County, the Task Force also addresses issues impacting the system on a Countywide basis. The Task Force membership includes representatives of the League Mr. Richard Claghorn April 3, 2017 Page 2

of California Cities-Los Angeles County Division, County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, City of Los Angeles, the waste management industry, environmental groups, the public, and a number of other governmental agencies.

Accordingly, the Task Force has reviewed the Partially Recirculated DEIR for the proposed Project in concert with our letter of August 25, 2014 (copy enclosed) and offers the following comments:

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

- On August 25, 2014, the Task Force provided comments for the Project's DEIR released on July 10, 2014. In section 1.4, Project Need, the Task Force requested to provide in-depth discussions substantiating the need for the expansion of the existing Chiquita Canyon Landfill (Landfill) taking into consideration the potential impacts from various legislative proposals and statutes currently in effect as of 2015. However, our review indicates these comments were not fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR. Additionally, two more State legislations have been enacted effective January 1, 2017, which further impacts the proposed Project and its Partially Recirculated DEIR. Namely SB 32, among other things, requires landfill GHG emission to be reduced to 60% of the year 1990 level by 2030. Further, the newly enacted SB 1382, among other GHG reductions, requires all jurisdictions in California reduce the amount of organic waste landfilled by 75% as compared to the amount disposed of in 2014 by the year 2025. The previous comments together with the SB 32 and SB 1383 mandates need to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.
- Additionally, the Task Force requested to Incorporate a discussion in this Chapter (Chapter 1) regarding how the proposed Project would meet the siting criteria specified in the June 1997 Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element, Volume I-The Element, Chapter 6-Facility Siting Criteria. This comment is yet to be addressed as well. These comments need to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.
- Section 1.3, Project Purpose and Objective, and Section 1.4, Project Need These Sections made numerous references to the studies conducted by the LACDPW and the Task Force to signify the need for further in- Los Angeles County disposal capacity. Based on the subject analysis, it is clear that the Project will not be accepting any solid waste from sources out of-Los Angeles County for disposal. This point needs to be made clear in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.

Mr. Richard Claghorn April 3, 2017 Page 3

#### Chapter 2: Project Description

- The final permitted elevation includes the final cover. Please revise the sentence in section 2.2.2.2 Detailed Description to read, "The Proposed Project also will increase the permitted elevation of the landfill by 143 feet to a maximum elevation of 1,573 feet, <u>including the final cover</u>", emphasize added. These comment needs to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.
- In section 2.2.3, Type of Material to be Received, please identify any other materials (e.g. friable/non-friable asbestos, radioactive and liquid waste) that are proposed or may be prohibited from being accepted at the Landfill. These comments need to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.
- In the Table 2-1. Beneficial Use Materials, Typical Use at CCL, since Mixed Organics composting facility will be part of the Project, pre- and post-consumer food waste should be listed under the "Material Type Diverted from Waste Disposal" column in Table 2-1. Also, the description under the "Typical Beneficial Use at CCL" column for pre- and post-consumer food waste, as well as Shredded Curbside Green Waste, should include "Used as feedstock for the 'Mixed Organics' composting facility." These comments need to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.
- In section 2.2.6.4, Load Checking and Waste Screening Provide a description on how radioactive waste and odiferous loads will be checked and screened, and what measures will be implemented when such wastes or loads are identified. These comments need to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.
- The Partially Recirculated DEIR needs to specify the locations of any potential soil stockpile areas including the duration of the stockpiles at those locations. These comments need to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.
- 2.2.8.8 Nuisance and Health Hazard Monitoring It has been stated on Page 2-45 that "During compost processing, odors are controlled by maintaining aerobic conditions in the windrows where yard waste is deposited for composting. The compost windrows are monitored for temperature, oxygen content, and moisture on a daily basis to provide odor and process control." The composting operation is relatively close to the Community of Vale Verde and there is significant potential for odor nuisance caused by food waste decomposition. To mitigate the resulting odor nuisance, the Partially Recirculated DEIR needs to provide an analysis for conducting aerobic composting in an enclosed structure(s) operating under negative pressure.

Mr. Richard Claghorn April 3, 2017 Page 4

## Chapter 11.1 Air Quality

- Section 11.4.2 State Regulation and Standards All references to the "California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB)" need to be deleted since the CIWMB no longer exist and has been replaced by CalRecycle. Additionally, while the document provides discussions in reference to odor monitoring and mitigations, the suggested measures have not served the Sunshine Canyon neighboring community well. The Community and SCAQMD would be a good source of information to expand on the mitigation measures provided.
- Section 11.4.3 Local Regulations and Standards Expand this Section to specifically reference the requirements of the Title 11 of the County Code, Section 11.02.300 (E) being enforced by the Los Angeles County Health Officer and elaborate on measures to prevent nuisances due to odors emanating from the Landfill including those related to the working face, leachate, landfill gas control system, and "Mixed Organics" composting operations. If the removal or peeling back of daily cover prior to placing waste on each operating day is being proposed discuss how odors will be managed and contained.

## Chapter 18: Project Alternatives

 No Project Alternative Conclusion 18.3.1.3 (Pg. 18-7). In the second bullet, delete or revise the last sentence. The sentence is to read Under those circumstances, additional unanticipated significant environmental impacts of increased waste disposal could be transferred to other locations in the county or elsewhere. To change permits or expand-other sites, each permitting agency would have to undertake a permit revision, as discretionary projects under CEQA. Changes to permits would potentially entail a public review process under CEQA."

Depending on each landfill's respective permits, other facilities may or may not need to change their permits to accept waste from Chiquita Canyon Landfill. These comments need to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.

• Environmental Analysis 18.3.2.2 (Pg. 18-11) - Under Visual Resources, add a sentence at the end to the first paragraph "however, a certain vantage points, the landfill's operation and working face could be visible." This section states that "Impacts would be less than significant". However, we believe the impact is
Mr. Richard Claghorn April 3, 2017 Page 5

significant and unavoidable. These comments need to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.

• Environmental Analysis 18.3.2.6 (Pg. 18-16). Under Visual Resources, this section states that "*Impacts would be less than significant*". However, we believe the impact is significant and unavoidable. These comments need to be fully addressed in the Partially Recirculated DEIR.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Mike Mohajer of the Task Force at <u>MikeMohajer@yahoo.com</u> or (909) 592-1147.

Sincerely,

Margaret Clark

Margaret Clark, Vice Chair Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/ Integrated Waste Management Task Force and Mayor Pro Tem, City of Rosemead

ND:kk P:\eppub\EnvAff\EA\TF\TF\Letters\2017\April\ChiquitaCanyonLandfillTFComments.docx

Enc.

cc: Each Member of the County of Los Angeles Regional Planning Commission County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning (Richard Bruckner) Each Member of the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force Each Member of the Facility & Planning Review Subcommittee



LOS ANGELES COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE/ INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE 900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE, ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331 P.O. BOX 1460, ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460 www.lacountyiswmtf.org

GAIL FARBER CHAIR

MARGARET CLARK VICE-CHAIR

August 25, 2014

Ms. Iris Chi County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning Zoning Permits North Section, Room 1348 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Ms. Chi:

#### COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL MASTER PLAN REVISION PROJECT NO.: R2004-00559-(5)

The Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/Integrated Waste Management Task Force (Task Force) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision, Project No. R2004-00559-(5), which was released for public review on July 10, 2014.

The proposed Project, among other things, entails increasing the permitted daily disposal tonnage from 6,000 to 12,000 tons per day; increasing the disposal footprint laterally by 143 acres; and increasing the maximum elevation by 143 feet. As indicated in the DEIR, this would extend the existing Chiquita Canyon Landfill's life by additional 21 to 38 years, depending on the amount of the daily disposal rate. The Project also provides for the development of an on-site household hazardous facility and an open mixed organics composting operation while setting-aside a portion of the subject site for possible development of a conversion technology facility, sometime in the future.

As provided by Chapter 3.67 of the Los Angeles County Code and the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939 [AB 939], as amended), the Task Force is responsible for coordinating the development of all major solid waste planning documents prepared for the County of Los Angeles and the 88 cities in Los Angeles County. Consistent with these responsibilities and to ensure a coordinated,

cost-effective, and environmentally-sound solid waste management system in Los Angeles County, the Task Force also addresses issues impacting the system on a Countywide basis. The Task Force membership includes representatives of the League of California Cities-Los Angeles County Division, County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, City of Los Angeles, the waste management industry, environmental groups, the public, and a number of other governmental agencies.

Accordingly, the Task Force has reviewed the DEIR for the proposed Project and offers the following comments:

#### Project Need:

#### Need for Landfill Capacity:

In-depth discussions substantiating the need for expansion of the existing Chiquita Canyon Landfill (Landfill) including the following key points need to be provided:

- Identify jurisdictions that currently utilize the Landfill for disposal of municipal solid waste (MSW) as well as jurisdictions to be served by the Project.
- Discuss whether any out-of-County waste will be accepted at the Landfill.
- Discuss the impacts of the full development of the Waste-by-Rail System to the Mesquite Regional Landfill by the County Sanitation Districts of the Los Angeles County on the proposed Landfill expansion.
- Address impacts from the following 2014 legislative proposals and statutes currently in effect on the need for additional landfill capacity, including, but not limited, to the following:
  - Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (the California Global Warming Solution Act of 2006 [Act]) Mandatory commercial recycling to achieve a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions of five million metric tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) equivalents.
  - AB 32 [Act] Mandatory commercial organic waste recycling program if the Legislature fails to pass legislation in 2014 that would accomplish the same.
  - AB 341 (2011) State legislative mandated policy goal of achieving a 75-percent recycling rate by the year 2020.

- AB 1594 (2014) Beginning January 1, 2020, using green waste as alternative daily cover (ADC) would no longer constitute diversion but rather be considered disposal for purposes of AB 939. Additionally, it prohibits disposal of green material by a jurisdiction that is not in compliance with AB 939 diversion mandates
- AB 1826 Starting April 1, 2016, it would require businesses, governmental entities and multi-family residential of five units and more that generate certain thresholds of organic waste per week to implement a mandatory commercial organic waste recycling program consistent with the requirements of the bill and the host jurisdiction. Failure of a jurisdiction (city/county) to monitor and enforce the implementation of a commercial organic waste recycling program by businesses within the said city/county may subject the jurisdiction to a daily penalty of \$10,000 even if the jurisdiction is in full compliance with the AB 939 diversion mandates. The goal of the legislation is to reduce the amount of organic waste being disposed in landfills and transformation facilities in 2014 by 50 percent by the year 2020.
- Senate Bill 498 Revises the definition of "biomass conversion" to mean the production of heat, fuel, or electricity by the controlled combustion, or the use of other noncombustion thermal conversion technologies on biomass materials.

It should be noted that the Legislature has approved AB 1594, AB 1826, and SB 498 and the bills need to be signed by the Governor in order for them to take effect on January 1, 2015.

## Need for Development of Composting, Anaerobic Digestion, and Conversion Technology Capacity

Provide in-depth discussions and analysis for on-site development of facilities using the above processes in conjunction with the full and/or partial development of the Landfill expansion.

#### Chapter 1.0 (Introduction)

- Federal, State, and Local Approvals, Section 1.5.2 (Pg. 1-12). Table 1-3 does not specify the associated water permits under "State Water Resources Control Board" and "RWQCB," and should be revised to include the following:
  - Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Stormwater Monitoring Program (SWMP) under "State Water Resources Control Board."
  - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) under "RWQCB"
- County of Los Angeles Approvals, Section 1.5.3 (Pg. 1-12). Include the following in addition to the required permits and approvals listed in this Section:

Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/Integrated Waste Management Task Force

• Finding of Conformance with the Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element

<u>Siting Criteria</u>—Incorporate a discussion regarding how the proposed Project would meet the siting criteria specified in the June 1997 Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element, Volume I-The Element, Chapter 6-Facility Siting Criteria.

#### Chapter 2.0 (Project Description)

- Lateral Extension of the Waste Footprint and Increased Maximum Elevation, Section 2.2.2 (Pg. 2-5). The current CUP has a maximum permitted elevation of 1,430 feet, as shown in the approved Exhibit "A" Site Plan. Revise the third sentence under this Section to read, "The Proposed Project also will increase the permitted elevation of the landfill by 143 feet to a maximum elevation of 1,573 feet, including the final cover."
- Wastes to be Received, Section 2.2.4 (Pg. 2-6). Clarify whether sludge and sludge components (or biosolids) are proposed to be prohibited from being accepted as part of the Project. Also, identify any other materials (e.g. friable/non-friable asbestos, radioactive and liquid waste) that are proposed to be prohibited from being accepted at the Landfill.

- Materials Diverted from Waste Disposal and Typical Beneficial Reuse at CCL, Table 2-2 (Pg. 2-15). If a "Mixed Organics" composting facility will be part of the Project, pre- and post-consumer food waste should be listed under the "Material Type Diverted from Waste Disposal" column in Table 2-2. Also, the description under the "Beneficial Reuse at CCL" column for pre- and post-consumer food waste, as well as Shredded Curbside Green Waste, should include "Used as feedstock for the 'Mixed Organics' composting facility." Also, see comments under the Project Need Section.
- Materials to be Diverted from Waste Disposal, Section 2.2.5 (Pg. 2-15). Describe whether or not the 20,505 cubic yards per day of diverted materials analyzed include food waste, and whether this value is in addition to the 12,000 tons per day disposal limit. Also, see comments under the Project Need Section.
- Load Checking and Waste Screening, Section 2.2.7.2 (Pg. 2-16). Provide a
  description on how radioactive waste and odiferous loads will be checked and
  screened, and what measures will be implemented when such wastes or loads
  are identified.
- Hours of Operation, Section 2.2.7.4 (Pg. 2-17). According to Section 2.2.10 Household Hazardous Waste Facility, a HHW facility will be constructed on site. Indicate the operating days and hours of the HHW facility in this Section.
- Disposal and Cover Procedures, Section 2.2.7.7 (Pg. 2-18). Discuss whether the Landfill will continue the practice of removing or peeling back the daily cover at the beginning of each operation day. If such practice is proposed please indicate any potential impacts such as those pertaining to odor, vector and other quality of life issues as well as potential mitigating measures to address possible negative impacts.
- Sewage and Water, Section 2.2.7.8 (Pg. 2-18). Address the adequacy of the water supply to accommodate dust control and irrigation even after the Newhall Land and Farming Projects are developed. If water supply is inadequate, identify measures to mitigate any potential shortage in water supply to support landfill operations.
- Traffic, Section 2.2.7.9 (Pg. 2-19 to 2-21). Identify the source of traffic that would be considered "Other" outbound traffic in Tables 2-3 to 2-5. Clarify whether the outbound trucks include those hauling leachate, household hazardous waste from the HHW facility, compost materials, and comingled recyclables.

- Excavation, Section 2.2.8.1 (Pg. 2-21). Specify the locations of any potential soil stockpile areas including the duration of the stockpiles at those locations.
- Excavation, Section 2.2.8.1 (Pg. 2-22). Revise the reference in the last paragraph to reflect the correct reference regarding soil quantities.
- Leachate Monitoring, Section 2.2.9.3 (Pg. 2-33). Indicate whether there are any plans to install a leachate treatment facility onsite. If such a facility is planned, provide detailed information including site location, facility capacity, and any associated structures for storing treated leachate for beneficial use.
- Nuisance and Health Hazard Monitoring, Odor, Section 2.2.9.6 (Pg. 2-35). In concert with the Section 11.02.300 (E) of Title 11 of the Los Angeles County Code, elaborate on measures to prevent nuisances due to odors emanating from the Landfill including those related to the working face, leachate, landfill gas control system, and "Mixed Organics" composting operations. If the removal or peeling back of daily cover prior to placing waste on each operating day is being proposed discuss how odors will be managed and contained.
- Household Hazardous Waste Facility, Section 2.2.10 (Pg. 2-41). Indicate the duration the materials collected at the HHW facility are expected to be stored onsite, as well as the frequency of delivery of the materials, and mitigation measures to ensure the health and safety of the surrounding residents and staff.
- Mixed Organics Composting Facility, Section 2.2.11 (Pg. 2-42). In accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, § 17863.4, "All compostable material handling operations and facilities shall prepare, implement and maintain a site-specific odor impact minimization plan. A complete plan shall be submitted to the [Enforcement Agency] with the [Enforcement Agency] Notification or permitted application." Accordingly, describe the preparation and submittal of an Odor Impact Minimization Plan (OIMP) to the appropriate Local Enforcement Agency for review and approval. In addition, consistent with Title 11 of the Los Angeles County Code, Section 11.02.300 (E), the OIMP also needs to be submitted to the Los Angeles County Health Officer (the County Department of Public Health) for review and approval.

## Chapter 3.0 General Setting and Resource Area Analysis

• Cumulative Impacts, Section 3.2.9 (Pg. 3-4). Table 3-1, needs to include additional information regarding the proposed residential developments in the vicinity of the Landfill, including the distance from the disposal footprint to the

> nearest enclosed structures. One of the siting criterion contained in the County of Los Angeles Countywide Siting Element, which was approved by a majority of the cities containing a majority of the incorporated population, followed by the County Board of Supervisors, and CalRecycle in 1998, prohibits construction of buildings or structure on or within 1,000 feet of a land disposal facility which contains decomposable materials/waste unless the facility is isolated by an approved natural or manmade protective system. Furthermore, as a point of reference, the CUP for the Puente Hills Landfill, when in effect, contained a requirement for the disposal footprint to be at least 2,000 feet away from the residential community.

### Chapter 4.0 Land Use

- Planned Surrounding Land Uses, Section 4.5.3 (Pg. 4-4). Provide additional analyses of some of the major residential developments within the vicinity of the proposed Project, including but not limited to the Newhall Land and Farming residential developments, which consists of approximately 7,200 units. It is imperative that the DEIR acknowledges all existing and proposed residential, educational, and immobile population developments that may be impacted by the proposed Project, and measures to protect public health and safety, and the environment.
- Potential Impacts, Mitigation Measures, Significant After Mitigation, and Cumulative Impacts; Sections 4.6 to 4.9 (Pg. 4-4 to 4-6). Update the information in Sections 4.6 to 4.9 to include any potential impacts and associated mitigation measures for the proposed Project. If these impacts and mitigation measures are further discussed in other portions of the DEIR, please include references to those chapters.

#### Chapter 5.0 Geology and Hydrogeology

 According the DEIR, there is potential for debris flow to encroach outside of the Landfill property. Please provide additional analysis to demonstrate the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures to prevent any potential encroachments onto the proposed residential developments to the west and south of the Landfill property.

#### Chapter 6.0 Surface Water Drainage

• According the DEIR, there is also potential for mud flow to affect operations onsite as well as outside of the Landfill property. Provide additional analyses to

> demonstrate the adequacy of the sedimentation basins at the Landfill to accommodate any increases in onsite water runoff to prevent any releases to nearby properties and existing flood plains in the vicinity of the Landfill property.

#### Chapter 11.0 Air Quality

- Analyses contained in this Chapter need to be consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan Update which was approved by the Air Resources board on May 22, 2014.
- Criteria Pollutant Emission Impacts, Section 11.9.2.1 (Pg. 11-37). According to the DEIR, impacts to air quality are significant and unavoidable due to water availability concerns for irrigation and dust control. However, discussions in the Water Supply, Section 14.5.2.5 (Pg. 14-6) of the DEIR concluded there is sufficient amount of water that can be used for dust control and irrigation for the Project. The DEIR needs to clarify this discrepancy.
- Operation Impacts, Section 11.6.3.2 (Pg. 11-31). Airborne particulate matters may be a substantial health risk to communities in the vicinity of the Landfill. Therefore, the DEIR needs to provide detailed analysis regarding the effects of wind direction and airborne particulate matters associated with operations of the Landfill and the open Mixed Organics Composting Facility. The proposed increase in elevation in combination with prevailing wind patterns may result in particulate matters being blown into existing or proposed residential, educational, and immobile population developments.
- Operation Impacts, Section 11.6.3.2 (Pg. 11-31). Provide additional discussions and analyses regarding any odor issues the Project may create as a result of the proposed increase in elevation and open Mixed Organics Composting Facility. If the Landfill operates at higher elevations there may be greater potential for odors to travel offsite into nearby communities.
- Operation Impacts, Section 11.6.3.2 (Pg. 11-31). Include additional analyses regarding any potential impacts associated with the operation of the proposed "Mixed Organics" composting operation at the Landfill, and provide any mitigation measures if found to have a significant impact.

#### Chapter 12.0 Greenhouse Gas Emission and Climate Change

• The analysis in this Chapter may need to be updated to be consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan Update which was approved by the Air Resources Board on May 22, 2014.

#### Chapter 15.0 Visual Resources

 Potential impacts to Visual Resources may be considered significant and unavoidable due to the proposed Newhall Land and Farming residential developments, of which 7,200 units will be constructed immediately west and south of the landfill, respectively. Mitigation measures should be proposed to minimize the view of the Landfill and/or Mixed Organics Composting operation from these future residential developments.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Mike Mohajer of the Task Force at <u>MikeMohajer@yahoo.com</u> or (909) 592-1147.

Sincerely,

Margaret Clark

Margaret Clark, Vice Chair Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/ Integrated Waste Management Task Force and Mayor Pro Tem, City of Rosemead

KM:fm P\eppub\EnvAffairs\EnvAffairs\TF\TF\Letters\2014\Chiquita DEIR\_Aug2014

cc: Each Member of the County of Los Angeles Regional Planning Commission
 County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning (Richard Bruckner)
 Waste Connections, Inc. (Mike Dean, District Manager)
 Each Member of the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
 Each Member of the Facility & Planning Review Subcommittee

## **Richard Claghorn**

| From:    | Jeremiah Dockray <jdockray@gmail.com></jdockray@gmail.com> |
|----------|--|
| Sent:    | Monday, April 03, 2017 3:07 PM                             |
| То:      | Rosie Ruiz   |
| Cc:      | Richard Claghorn   |
| Subject: | Opposition to Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion           |

**Dear LA County Regional Planning Commissioners:** 

I am writing to express my personal opposition for Chiquita Canyon Landfill's FEIR for The Master Plan Revision. This is an inadequate and unnecessary plan for the landfill.

As a resident, I recognize that Chiquita Canyon has been too close to nearby communities for more than four decades, and plays a big role in the decline of air quality of the Santa Clarita Valley. This is especially important considering that its expansion would make the air quality and traffic in the SCV much worse, all while communities continue to be built nearby.

In looking at the DEIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon has not carefully considered the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. The report states that daily emissions of PM2.5 (dust particles) from construction and operation would *exceed the Air Quality Management District threshold* and that even with additional mitigation, PM2.5 would *"remain potentially significant and unavoidable."* (ES.6.8, Air Quality).

Aside from the issues surrounding the PM2.5 levels, there is no local data for Hydrogen Sulfide and Vinyl Chloride levels for the landfill in the report. Hydrogen Sulfide odor above 30 ppm is described as sweet or sickeningly sweet often the smell residents have reported smelling from the landfill site [https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/hydrogensulfide/hazards.htm1]. At your 2014 hearing on the expansion residents testified to having symptoms of Hydrogen Sulfide poisoning including nausea, headaches, burning eyes and airway problems. One resident in his testimony described the symptoms as "It's like someone's choking me." Until there is more data on air quality and health conditions in Val Verde and surrounding areas this project must not be approved.

The landfill is also ignoring their contract with the nearby community of Val Verde – something I feel is unacceptable, and sets further precedent for broken promises to the SCV, much to the ongoing frustration of area residents.

Over the years, Chiquita Canyon has been caught taking in sludge (which is not permitted there), in addition to numerous violations in regard to its smell. This reflects the site's inability to manage itself at its current size, much less at double its size.

The environmental report also states "...cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase **cancer risk** by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a *significant cumulative impact*." The cancer risk is at 15 which is 5 above the threshold. (11.9.2.3, Health Impacts) I urge the Commission to look forward to a different waste plan to help protect the citizens of the Santa Clarita Valley by considering the amount of people that are poised to live in its wake, as well as the 13,000 children that currently attend school as close as 0.8 miles away from the project.

As a result, I am adamantly opposed to the findings of the FEIR and the Master Plan Revision, and recommend finding a new way. Please close Chiquita Landfill as scheduled back in 1997. Please recommend to the Board of Supervisors not to grant this expansion.

Sincerely,

Jeremiah Dockray

Val Verde Resident Castaic Area Town Council Member (Region 2)

## **Richard Claghorn**

| From:    | Margo Parker <maoparker@gmail.com></maoparker@gmail.com> |
|----------|--|
| Sent:    | Monday, April 03, 2017 3:36 PM                           |
| То:      | Rosie Ruiz   |
| Cc:      | Richard Claghorn   |
| Subject: | Opposition for Chiquita Canyon Landfill                  |

Dear LA County Regional Planning Commissioners:

I am writing to express my personal opposition for Chiquita Canyon Landfill's FEIR for The Master Plan Revision. This is an inadequate and unnecessary plan for the landfill.

As a resident, I recognize that Chiquita Canyon has been too close to nearby communities for more than four decades, and plays a big role in the decline of air quality of the Santa Clarita Valley. This is especially important considering that its expansion would make the air quality and traffic in the SCV much worse, all while communities continue to be built nearby.

In looking at the DEIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon has not carefully considered the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. The report states that daily emissions of PM2.5 (dust particles) from construction and operation would *exceed the Air Quality Management District threshold* and that even with additional mitigation, PM2.5 would *"remain potentially significant and unavoidable."* (ES.6.8, Air Quality).

Aside from the issues surrounding the PM2.5 levels, there is no local data for Hydrogen Sulfide and Vinyl Chloride levels for the landfill in the report. Hydrogen Sulfide odor above 30 ppm is described as sweet or sickeningly sweet often the smell residents have reported smelling from the landfill site [https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/hydrogensulfide/hazards.html]. At your 2014 hearing on the expansion residents testified to having symptoms of Hydrogen Sulfide poisoning including nausea, headaches, burning eyes and airway problems. One resident in his testimony described the symptoms as "It's like someone's choking me." Until there is more data on air quality and health conditions in Val Verde and surrounding areas this project must not be approved.

The landfill is also ignoring their contract with the nearby community of Val Verde – something I feel is unacceptable, and sets further precedent for broken promises to the SCV, much to the ongoing frustration of area residents.

Over the years, Chiquita Canyon has been caught taking in sludge (which is not permitted there), in addition to numerous violations in regard to its smell. This reflects the site's inability to manage itself at its current size, much less at double its size.

The environmental report also states "...cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase cancer risk by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a *significant cumulative impact*." The cancer risk is at 15 which is 5 above the threshold. (11.9.2.3, Health Impacts) I urge the Commission to look forward to a different waste plan to help protect the citizens of the Santa Clarita Valley by considering the amount of people that are poised to live in its wake, as well as the 13,000 children that currently attend school as close as 0.8 miles away from the project.

As a result, I am adamantly opposed to the findings of the FEIR and the Master Plan Revision, and recommend finding a new way. Please close Chiquita Landfill as scheduled back in 1997.

Sincerely, Margo Throckmorton

## **Richard Claghorn**

| From:<br>Sent:<br>To:           | Susie Evans <sheffs@pacbell.net><br/>Monday, April 03, 2017 6:17 PM<br/>Mark Ridley-Thomas; Kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; Fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov;<br/>Sheila@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; planning@lacounty.gov;<br/>zonigldcc@planning.gov; Richard Claghorn; Robert Glaser; Oscar Gomez;<br/>executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov; Congressman Steve Knight; Rosie Ruiz</sheffs@pacbell.net>  |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Cc:<br>Subject:<br>Attachments: | danteacosta@gmail.com; senator.wilk@sen.ca.gov; 'assembly dante'; 'jerry'<br>Letter of Opposition to Chiquita Canyone Landfill Expansion and proof of violations<br>Cancer risk picture from revised DEIR.png; chiquita-city030117 SC City letter to Chiquita<br>about fees.pdf; Keep the dump card Lenny had to sign.jpg; Map of where trash comes from<br>1.jpg; Santa Paula Explosion.docx; Radiation 2009-07-14.pdf; Radiation 2009-08-24.pdf;<br>Radiation 2013-02-19.pdf; Radiation 2009-07-14.pdf; Radiation 2009-08-24.pdf; Radiation<br>2013-02-19.pdf; Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors April 2017.docx; Rocketdyne letter<br>re contaminated soils going to CCL.pdf |

Please forward this to all LA County Supervisors, LA County Planning Commission, State Assembly members, State Senate members, US Senate members and US Assembly members.

1

Susan M. Evans 29830 Lincoln Ave. Val Verde, CA 91384 Home 661-702-9782 Cell 661-433-1380 Email Sheffs@pacbell.net April 3, 2017

Los Angeles County Planning Department 320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion Project No. R2004-00559-(5) SCH No. 2005081071

Dear Sirs and Madams;

I will reiterate what I said at the March 1, 2017 hearing...

The supporters of the expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill are primarily businesses and organizations that are compensated by the dump.

They also have letters or cards from people who had no idea what the dump would use them for. They gave them to you as support letters and cards. I know these cards were falsely obtained by the Public Relations firm hired by the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, as I knew one personally; he has since passed from lung cancer. Some of the "supporters" are employees of the dump, (Steve Cassulo) of course they would support the continuation of their employment. I would have hoped your office would have vetted these "supporters".

The Castaic Area Town Council and many of it's board members are in favor of the expansion, because they want the money Chiquita Canyon Lnadfill will give to them.

City of Santa Clarita is in favor of the expansion and they ask for fees from all trash put in Chiquita Canyon Landfill from every piece of trash that comes from the City of Santa Clarita.

Everyone in favor of this expansion will financially gain. Everyone opposed doesn't want the money they are being offered, they want their health, they want to be able to breathe clean air, drink safe water, and have clean land.

The Chiquita Canyon Landfill also sued the Citizens for Chiquita Canyon Landfill Compliance on the premise they had the copy right to the name Chiquita Canyon. There is another canyon named Chiquita Canyon in the San Gabriel Valley as the C4CCLC group proved. When caught taking in sludge, they called it something else, but look through their reports, sludge is listed; Mike Dean called me a "blatant liar" at a public meeting and then denied it within minutes; calling the contract with Val Verde a term sheet to avoid honoring it; a reporter from Telemundo was told her career would be ruined if she aired the segment she filmed at my house; A COC student's work was severely edited (I was one of two Val Verde residents interviewed for his school project).

Waste Connections threatened to sue the entire VVCAC board in early 2016 when they heard there was testing of the air that they did not control, have access to the people taking the testing and the laboratory doing the testing of the air samples. They still insist they have to have the results of whatever testing may have been done and the name of the company that tested the air samples. Steve Cassulo gets very defensive when the VVCAC tells him the testing was inconclusive as there were too many mistakes made by the private citizens "trained" to take the air samples. Those are just some of the bullying tactics by the landfill.

The opposition is full of residents who have to live with the damage you create by allowing the landfill to expand. They cannot pay anyone, let alone big business, to defend them or to lobby on their behalf.

The Articles of Incorporation for the Val Verde Community Advisory Committee say in part B "The specific purpose of this corporation is to benefit the public and promote social welfare by; 1) serving as an oversight body, monitoring the emission of polluting substances and other matters of environmental concern arising from the operation of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill in Los Angeles County, California; and 2) serving as a liaison between the public and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, Regional Planning Commission and other regulatory agencies with respect to same." You can see this on the VVCAC web site <u>http://www.valverdecac.com/pdf/VVCAC%20Articles%20of%20Incorporation.pdf</u> as well as the contract that was signed in 1997 and the Meeting minutes from the LA County Board of Supervisors dated May 20, 1997. I read in the FEIR that Los Angeles County will not be held responsible or liable for what illegal activities or irresponsible actions the landfill may do. In return the county will get tipping fees from the dump in the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars per month. So, the county is benefitting from the expansion even if it pollutes, poisons, or does damage to the environment or human life.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill has taken in and been involved in lawsuits for the illegal and toxic substances they have already taken in that are affecting the health and life of everyone in the area. I have sent proof of these violations over and over and it would appear it doesn't matter to anyone in control. Why? Naturally, I can only assume it is because they get money from the landfill that they can spend any way they want, while the humans in the area are continually sickened and die from these violations.

Mr. Knight, you were questioned about the Chiquita Canyon Landfill expansion at your Town Hall Meeting in Palmdale/Lancaster recently. Your response to the gentleman was to give your staff his information and you would be glad to get with him and his group. What no one knew at the time was you requested the gentleman's social security number. He refused to give it to your staff.

Any one of you can contact the Citizens for Chiquita Canyon Landfill Compliance at <u>c4cclc@gmail.com</u>. You can also look at the web site <u>https://chiquitalandfill2014.wordpress.com/</u> This is a grass roots group, no particular political affiliation whatsoever, and just concerned citizens.

There is also the Val Verde Community Advisory Committee <u>http://www.valverdecac.com/index.php</u> where all documents can be found.

And the Val Verde Civic Association Facebook page <a href="https://www.facebook.com/vvcivic/">https://www.facebook.com/vvcivic/</a>

Another expansion and more years living with a stinky dump is not what the citizens working and living in the area surrounding the Chiquita Canyon Landfill want. Your constituents do not want this. We want to be able to breathe clean air, drink safe water, and have clean land for our lives. The mitigation money the landfill wants to give residents cannot be used for health issues, further burdening the health care system with medical issues that are localized to the area surrounding the dump.

Please stop the request of Chiquita Canyon Landfill and use Mesquite Landfill that your constituents/citizens have already paid for.

Now is the time to stop being greedy for money and big businesses and quit listening to the big business and their PR reps that twist the truth to their advantage to sway your decisions. It is time to start thinking of the little people who pay the taxes supporting your salary and elect you to office. Our numbers are growing and many of you reading this are risking future votes from people who will never vote for or support you again. This is the will of the people and you know it.

Thank you for your attention to this letter and this entire situation surrounding the expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Susan M. Evans 29830 Lincoln Ave. Val Verde, CA 91384 (661) 702-9782 home (661) 433-1380 cell Sheffs@pacbell.net

 CC: Katheryn Barger, Fifth District Supervisor Janice Hahn, Fourth District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Third District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Second District Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, First District Supervisor Dante Acosta, State Assembly Member 38<sup>th</sup> District Scott Wilk, State Senate Member 21<sup>st</sup> District Kamala Harris, US Senator of California Dianne Feinstein, US Senator of California Steve Knight, US Congressman 25<sup>th</sup> District



Impact Location

MEIR: residential maximally exposed individual MEIW: workplace maximally exposed individual HIC: chronic hazard index HIA: acute hazard index

Figure 11.5. Maximum Health Impact Locations from Proposed Project Construction and Operation 2015 OEHHA Guidance Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision



#### Susie Sheffield-Evans

December 17, 2016

Repost from a while back. Santa Clara Waste Water Plant Disaster Jim Mendrala from Val Verde To those new to our area you might find this of interest. Santa Clara Waste Water Plant Industrial Disaster

A vacuum truck exploded at the Santa Clara Waste Water plant in the early morning hours of November 18, 2014. Two workers were injured in the initial explosion, three responding fire-fighters were injured by the fumes from the spill of a highly volatile chemical mixture, and 50 others were exposed to fumes and required treatment at local hospitals. The driver was transporting waste from a temporary storage drum to a processing center when he stopped to take a meal break. The rear of the truck exploded, spreading a white liquid over a 300-by-400-foot area (91 by 122 m) that spontaneously combusted as it dried and was sensitive to shock, pressure and the application of water or oxygen. The tires of the first fire truck on the scene and the boots of three firefighters sparked small explosions when they drove and walked over the substance as they went to help the injured workers. The incident evolved into a disaster when later in the morning additional materials began to burn and explode, which resulted in a three-mile-long plume of toxic smoke (4.8 km) and the closing of Highway 126. Chemical smoke drifted over the area and nearby residents and businesses were required to evacuate.

#### Cause

What was initially reported as sewage was found to be about 1,000 US gallons (3,800 l; 830 imp gal) of a chemical mixture consisting of some sort of organic peroxide. In the first days of the investigation, officials speculated that two inert chemicals mistakenly mixed in the truck and created an organic peroxide substance with sulfuric acid appearing to be part of the mix. Organic peroxide combines unstably bound oxygen together with hydrogen and carbon in the same molecule and ignites easily and then burns rapidly and intensely. While field testing was performed on the reactive material for initial identification, the county hazardous materials manager found that laboratories would not test the chemicals over concerns that lab personnel could be injured or their equipment damaged. Three weeks after the incident, the substance was still highly susceptible to friction and seemed to react to something as slight as wind. Sodium chlorite was identified in an internal investigation by the firm in the months following the disaster. They claimed that the chemical was being using as a water treatment agent for the first time and was stored in the same type of storage container as wastewater. The worker combined the chemical with wastewater in the vacuum truck where the chemical interacting with organic material caused an explosion that blew off the back of the truck. A former county district attorney, retained by a company attorney, issued a report in March 2015 that provided an explanation of events indicating that the worker may have accidentally combined the chemicals. Later, investigators found that an inspection by a Defense Logistics Agency contractor was scheduled for that morning and officials of the firm had directed the transfer of these hazardous materials to another location. Aftermath

Although the explosion and resulting fumes caused injuries including the lungs of three fire-fighters who remained off-duty indefinitely, the material scattered around the site was found to be non-hazardous for cleanup purposes. The two fire engines that arrived first remained out of service for months and may ultimately have to be scrapped. The Ventura County Sheriff declared a local emergency so the Ventura County Board of Supervisors could ratify the action and allow the county to seek reimbursement for its costs from state disaster relief funds. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency oversaw the decontamination of the site. The material was neutralized and solidified on site. Tons of material were eventually taken to the Chiquita Canyon Landfill in nearby Castaic. Almost three months later on February 10, 2015, the County Supervisors ended the emergency declaration. With the permit to operate suspended, the firm needed to finish removing the waste materials and provide a plan that would show how another such incident would be prevented before being allowed to start accepting liquid waste again. County regulators and county supervisors also wanted the city of Oxnard to agree to accept the waste water again after an analysis of the safety of the pipeline. On August 7, 2015, a Ventura County grand jury indicted the Santa Clara Waste Water Co. and 10 other defendants. Following the indictment, the district attorney had the 10 defendants arrested on suspicion of several felonies and misdemeanors, including filing a false or forged instrument, dissuading a witness from reporting a crime, known failure to warn of serious concealed danger, withholding information regarding a substantial danger to public safety, conspiracy to commit a crime, causing impairment of an employee's body, and disposal of hazardous waste.

Site

The facility at 815 Mission Rock Road, Santa Paula, provided service to over 30,000 waste generators. At the time, it had received and processed over 2,000,000,000 US gallons (7.6×109 l) since it opened in 1959. The company says they treat about 100 different streams of waste. The owner of facility said that they never had a major problem such as this since the plant only takes non-hazardous waste. The capacity of the facility was increased to handle up to 100-US-gallon-per-minute (380 l; 83 imp gal) or 140,000-US-gallon-per-day (530,000 L) by 2014. The facility provides an environmentally safe and legal means of treating, disposing and recycling of contaminated but non-hazardous waste as an alternative to dumping untreated wastes into municipal sewer systems or into the environment. The plant uses centrifuges, electrocoagulation, carbon and micron filtration, ozone injection, dissolved air flotation, and chemical treatments. Treated waste water is sent through a pipeline to the Oxnard municipal treatment plant.

A consortium of six major oil companies (Chevron, Exxon, Mobil, Shell, Texaco and Unocal) established Santa Clara Waste Water to service their internal disposal needs. Eventually the site became a full-service disposal facility for most non-hazardous wastewater and was renamed Southern California Waste Water. The site is located in a 91-acre industrial area (37 ha) that is surrounded by agriculture and located about 2-mile southwest (3.2 km) of the Santa Paula city limits. Green Compass that operates the facility also operates a Class II injection well in Kern County that is tailored toward oilfield production and completion fluids. The only other commercial facility for disposal of oil field waste in the county, operated by Anterra Corp. in Oxnard, temporarily expanded operations after the incident.

References:

The Associated Press (November 19, 2014) "Crews try to ID substance in Calif. plant fire" Miami Herald
Wenner, Gretchen (November 26, 2014) "Oxnard shuts out Santa Clara Waste Water from sewer system" Ventura County Star

•• Wilson, Kathleen and Von Quednow, Cindy (November 21, 2014) "Truck explosion near Santa Paula draws scrutiny" Ventura County Star (subscription may be required for this article)

• Von Quednow, Cindy (November 18, 2014) "Santa Paula chemical explosion causes injuries, evacuations, road closures" Ventura County Star

• Rocha, Veronica (November 18, 2014) "2 dozen treated after truck explodes; chemical hits air, ignites" Los Angeles Times

• Kelly, Peggy (November 27, 2014) "'3-mile plume of toxic smoke': VC Sheriff declares emergency in wake of SCWW blasts, fires" Santa Paula Times

• Aguilar, Mercedes (Nov 22, 2014) "Evacuation order lifted near Santa Paula explosion site" Ventura County Star

•• Von Quednow, Cindy (November 19, 2014) "Officials work to identify, clean up chemical in Santa Paula explosion" Ventura County Star

•• Von Quednow, Cindy (November 20, 2014) "Businesses take stock after Santa Paula chemical explosion" Ventura County Star

•• Wilson, Kathleen (December 5, 2014) "Cleanup of spill slow as county shuts plant indefinitely" Ventura County Star

•• Wilson, Kathleen (March 3, 2015). "Accidental mixture led to blast, former DA says". Ventura County Star. (subscription may be required for this article)

•• Wilson, Kathleen (February 9, 2015) "Chemical that triggered Santa Paula blast identified" Ventura County Star

• Cole, Matt (September 8, 2015). "Crime report: Eleven indicted after explosion of vacuum cargo tank trailer". Commercial Carrier Journal (CCJ) Online. Tuscaloosa, AL: Randall-Reilly.

•• Wilson, Kathleen (December 16, 2014) "Crops cleared but farm losses from blast estimated at \$1 million" Ventura County Star (subscription may be required for this article)

•• Staff (November 27, 2014) "Local emergency declared for Santa Paula explosion, fire" Ventura County Star

•• Wilson, Kathleen (January 6, 2015) "Waste company sues insurer over chemical blast cleanup" Ventura County Star

•• Wilson, Kathleen (February 10, 2015) "County calls off emergency declaration triggered by plant explosion" Ventura County Star

•• Wilson, Kathleen (March 14, 2015). "Santa Paula company moves to reopen plant amid questions". Ventura County Star. (subscription may be required for this article)

•• Wilson, Kathleen (August 19, 2015). "DA reports finding falsified records in Santa Clara Waste Water case". Ventura County Star.

•• "About Us" Green Compass Environmental Solutions website Accessed 19 November 2014

•• Moreno, John A.; Pascucci, Christina; Pamer, Melissa; and Chambers, Rick (November 18, 2014) "Dozens Injured When Vacuum Truck Explodes in Santa Paula Area" KTLA

•• "Santa Clara Waste Water using Electrocoagulation" Santa Barbara, California Natural Systems Accessed 21 November 2014

• Wilson, Kathleen (November 20, 2014) "Oil field waste diverted to Anterra in wake of Santa Paula explosion" Ventura County Star (subscription may be required for this article)

LikeShow more reactionsComment

Like

Comment

Comments



Suste Sheffield-Evans Susie Sheffield-Evans This is where he parked Link - https://www.vcreporter.com/2015/11/19/the-hazardous-truth/

Image may contain: outdoor



The hazardous truth

One year later, a deeper look at what happened at the Santa Paula waste water site VCREPORTER.COM

Like Reply Remove Preview December 17, 2016 at 5:44pm



Steven Montgomery Lee What was not mentioned in this article was that Chiquita Canyon trucks were there, and they had in them things that they were not permitted to carry, but slated to come to their landfill. Unlike Reply 1 December 17, 2016 at 5:49pm

| 2<br>2<br>3<br>4, C/                              | CIWMB Focused<br>CIWMB Periodic Time Out:                      | 200  | YY)<br>9   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2<br>int C  | CIWMB Focused<br>CIWMB Periodic Time In:                       | 200  | 9  | 15   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A, C/   | CIWMB Focused<br>CIWMB Periodic Time Out:                      | 2 0 0  | 2  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A, C/   | CIWMB Focused Time In: In<br>CIWMB Periodic Time Out: Received | ispection  |  | $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 9 & - &   & A &   & - &   & 0 &   & 0 &   & 5 &   & 2 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 4 &   & 2 &   & 0 &   & 9 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 4 &   & 2 &   & 0 &   & 9 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 4 &   & 2 &   & 0 &   & 9 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 4 &   & 2 &   & 0 &   & 9 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 4 &   & 2 &   & 0 &   & 9 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 &   & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & $ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A, C  | CIWMB Periodic Time Out:                                       |  | Time   | 5  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A, C/   | Roceive<br>L<br>Owner  | and these / dities   | OAttachments On File (Not S  | Scaned)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ۹, C/   | J  | en By lop  | erator) Signature  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A, C/   | Gentitut   | Signature  | All present)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pect  | 29201 HENRY MAYO DR., VALENCIA, CA                             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inspector Inspector Signature Also Present (Name) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ED IN (   | ABLE SECTIONS OF DIVISION 30 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES           | I CODE (PRC), I  | NO TITLE 14 AND TITLE 27 CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGLATION AWAREA OF CONCERN  | SNEICCA)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A   | SPREADING/COMPACTING   | V A  | CONTROLS   | VA   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q   | 20840 - SPREADING/COMPACTING                                   | 00   | 20840 - NOISE CONTROL  | QC   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 20650 - GRADING OF FILL SURFACES                               |  | 20860 - TRAFFIC CONTROL  | 00   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 20660 - STOCKPIUNG   | 00   | 20870 - HAZARDOUS WASTES   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | DAILY & INTERMEDIATE COVER                                     |  | 20860 - MEDICAL WASTES   | 190  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20570 - AVAILABILITY OF COVER MATERIAL                         | 00   | 20880 - DEAD ANIMALS   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 20680 - DAILY COVER  | 00   | 20900 - AIR CRITERIA   | <u> 0 </u>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20590 - ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER                                | 00   | GAS MONITORING & CONTROL   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 20695 - PERFORMANCE STANDARDS                                  | 00   | 20918 - EXEMPTIONS   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20700 - INTERMEDIATE COVER                                     | 00   | 20919 - GAS CONTROL  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$  | 20688 - BENEFICIAL REUSE                                       |  | 20919.5 - EXPLOSIVE GAS CONTROL  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | HANDLING, EQUIPMENT & MAINTENANCE                              |  | CLOSURE  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20710 - SCAVENGING/SALVAGING/STORAGE                           | 00   | 21110 - TIME FRAMES FOR CLOSURE  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20720 - NON-SALVAGEABLE ITEMS                                  | 00   | 21780 - SUBMITTAL CLOSURE PLANS  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20730 - VOLUME REDUCTION/ENERGY RECOVERY                       | O O  | TIRES  | 2523   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ο   | 20740 - EQUIPMENT  | 00   | 17351 - FIRE PREVENTION MEASURES   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20750 - SITE MAINTENANCE                                       | 00   | 17352 - FACILITY ACCESS SECURITY   | <u> 0</u>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | CONTROLS   |  | 17353 - VECTOR CONTROL   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20760 - NUISANCE CONTROL                                       | 00   | 17354 - STORAGE  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ę211  | 20770 - ANIMAL FEEDING   | 00   | 17355 - DISPOSAL   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20780 - OPEN BURNING/BURNING WASTES                            | 00   | 17356 - INDOOR STORAGE   | 00   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| O   | 20790 - LEACHATE CONTROL                                       | 00   | OTHER  | 1.111  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20600 - DUST CONTROL   | 00   | 20921(b)GAS MONITORING AND C   | <u> </u>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20810 - VECTOR AND BIRD CONTROL                                | 00   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 20220 - DRAINAGE & EROSION CONTROL                             | 00   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0   | 20830 - LITTER CONTROL   | 00   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and the owner of the owner.                       |  |  | .)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | ED IN COMPLIANCE UNLESS OTHERWISE MARKED WITH         A       SPREADING/COMPACTING         Q       20640 - SPREADING/COMPACTING         Q       20650 - GRADING OF FILL SURFACES         20660 - STOCKPILING       DAILY & INTERMEDIATE COVER         Q       20670 - AVAILABILITY OF COVER MATERIAL         20680 - ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER         20680 - ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER         20680 - ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER         20680 - DAILY COVER         20700 - INTERMEDIATE COVER         Q       20700 - INTERMEDIATE COVER         Q       20710 - SCAVENGING/SALVAGING/STORAGE         Q       20720 - NON-SALVAGEABLE ITEMS         Q       20750 - SITE MAINTENANCE         Q       20750 - SITE MAINTENANCE         Q       20750 - SITE MAINTENANCE         Q       20750 - OPEN BURNING/BURNING WASTES | EDIN COMPLIANCE UNLESS OTHERWISE MARKED WITH ONE OF THE         A       SPREADING/COMPACTING       V         Q       20640 - SPREADING/COMPACTING       Q         Q       20650 - GRADING OF FILL SURFACES       Q         20660 - STOCKPILING       Q       Q         Q       20670 - AVAILABILITY OF COVER MATERIAL       Q         20680 - ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER       Q         20680 - DAILY & INTERMEDIATE COVER       Q         20680 - DAILY COVER       Q         20700 - INTERMEDIATE COVER       Q         Q       20700 - INTERMEDIATE COVER       Q         Q       20700 - SCAVENGING/SALVAGING/STORAGE       Q         Q       20710 - SCAVENGING/SALVAGING/STORAGE       Q         Q       20730 - VOLUME REDUCTION/ENERGY RECOVERY       Q         Q       20740 - EQUIPMENT       Q       Q         Q       20750 - STTE MAINTENANCE       Q       Q | EDIN COMPLEXES OTHERWISE MARKED WITH ONE OF THE FOLLOWING VEVICUATION AMAREA OF LUFILERY         A       SPREADING/COMPACTING         Q       26640 - SPREADING/COMPACTING         Q       26650 - GRADING OF FILL SURFACES         Q       26660 - STOCKPILING         Q       26660 - STOCKPILING         Q       26670 - AVAILABILITY OF COVER         Q       26670 - AVAILABILITY OF COVER MATERIAL         Q       26680 - DAILY COVER         Q       20690 - ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER         Q       20690 - ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER         Q       20919 - GAS CONTROL         20686 - BENEFICIAL REUSE       Q         Q       20710 - SCAVENGING/SALVAGING/STORAGE         Q       20710 - SCAVENGING/SALVAGING/STORAGE         Q       20720 - NON-SALVAGEABLE ITEMS  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**CIWMB Form 52 - Disposal Facility Inspection Report** Enforcement Agency: LOS ANGELES COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Page 2 of 2

Facility Name: CHIQUITA'CYN LANDFILL

Facility File Number: 19-AA-0052

Inspection Date: 07/14/2009

Comments Continued: NO LITTER OBSERVED ON HWY 126 AND STREET SWEEPER WAS IN OPERATION. LIGHTING DURING DARK HOUR WAS SATISFACTORY AND NO TRASH /ODOR DETECTED IN THE VALVERDE AREA.

THE GAS PLAN RESUBMITTED TO CIWMB TO COMPLY WITH TITLE 27 REQUIREMENTS, HAS BEEN APPROVED, THE AREA OF CONCERN IN REGARDS TO THE GAS PLAN, IS CONSIDERED ABATED.

A NEW RADIATION DETECTOR SYSTEM WAS INSTRALLED BY SCALES ON JULY 2, 2009. ON JULY 9, 2009, TWO LOADS WERE FOUND TO CONTAIN RADIATION. RADIATION MANAGEMENT WAS CONTACTED.

LEA HAS VERBALLY ADVISED MIKE DEAN, SITE MANAGER, THAT THE GREEN WASTE MATERIAL RECEIVED AND STORED ON SITE, NEEDS TO BE REMOVED WITHIN 7 DAYS. THE GREEN WASTE PILES NEED TO BE KEPT LOOSE ENOUGH SO AS TO PREVENT THE MATERIAL FROM COMPOSTING, LEA WILL MONITOR THE PILES DURING SITE VISITS.

ORGANIC SOULTIONS IS NO LONGER CONDUCTING COMPOSITING OPERATIONS AT CHIQUITA CANYON.



Rockatdyne Division Rockwell International Corporation 6633 Canoga Avenue Canoga Park, California 91303

> Telex: 698478 ROCKETDYN CNPK

31 August 1992

In reply refer to 92RC09217

County of Ventura Resource Management Agency Planning Division 800 South Victoria Avenue Ventura, CA 93009

Attention: Kelly Scoles

Subject: Sodium Disposal Facility Closure, Area IV, Santa Susana Field Laboratory

Ms. Scoles:

Rocketdyne, a Division of Rockwell International, is scheduling a cleanup and restoration of a site referred to as the Sodium Disposal Facility, located in Area IV, Santa Susana Field Laboratory. The Sodium Disposal Facility is located on Rockwell-owned land with a Department of Energy (DDE) option lease.

The cleanup and restoration is in response to the State of California, Regional Water Quality Control Board, "Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 91-061 (File No. 200.003), see enclosure. The project is being funded by DOE and is scheduled to be completed by 31 December 1992.

The project will require approximately 20,500 cu yd of excavation of which will be exported or stockpiled, quantities and destinations are as follows:

- Radioactive soils approximately 350 cu yd. These will be placed into DOT-approved shipping containers (44 cu ft each) and trucked from Santa Susana to Hanford, WA, which is a site licensed to receive radioactive materials. The route is from the work site, via Woolsey Canyon Road, to Plummer Avenue, to Topanga Canyon Boulevard to I-118. The route thereafter is essentially due North to Southeastern Washington state, through California and Oregon.
- 2. Mixed (hazardous and radioactive) waste soils approximately 150 cu yd. These will be placed into DOT-approved shipping containers (44 cu ft ea) and retained on Rocketdyne premises under a storage permit issued by EPA. The wastes will be treated to render them simply radioactive and shipped as above to Hanford, WA.



# SANTA CLARITA

#300

23920 Valencia Boulevard = Suite 300 = Santa Clarita, California 91355-2196 Phone: (661) 259-2489 = FAX: (661) 259-8125 www.santa-clarita.com

January 9, 2017

Mr. Richard Claghorn County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning Zoning Permits North Section, Room 1348 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Claghorn:

Subject: Comments to the Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion

The City of Santa Clarita (City) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion.

On October 20, 2014, the City sent comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, located on the north side of the intersection of Highway 126 and Henry Mayo Drive, approximately seven miles west of the City boundary. The project site is of interest to the City because it is located in the Santa Clarita Valley and provides solid waste disposal services to the City and the region. The proposed project consists of the development of an additional 143 acres of land to the existing landfill currently in operation.

The City would like to thank you for your consideration and inclusion of the following comments on the DEIR prepared for the project:

#### Water Quality (WQ)

WQ1. Design and construct the liner system and the Leachate Collection and Removal System in accordance with the Construction Quality Assurance Plan, as approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

WQ2. Install and maintain a network of monitoring wells per the requirements of the RWQCB permit. Continue monitoring and data reporting in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program, as approved by RWQCB.

WQ3. Design and construct permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure site runoff does not adversely affect the Santa Clara River or downstream habitat in accordance with the

300-1

Mr. Richard Claghorn January 9, 2017 Page 2 of 5

RWQCB permit, the Los Angeles Department of Public Works Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan requirements, and the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance.

300-1 cont'd

#### Household Hazardous Waste Facility (HHWF)

#### Public Access to the Proposed Household Hazardous Waste Facility for Santa Clarita Residents

The project would establish a Household Hazardous Waste Facility to be open for the public to drop off common household chemicals for proper recycling and disposal. To best serve Santa Clarita residents, the City requests the facility maintain weekend operating hours to ensure the community has access to drop off materials outside of normal business hours.

300-2

300-3

#### Mixed Organic Composting Facility

#### Support the City's Daily Efforts to Divert Organic Material from the Landfill

The project should be required to maintain the continued use of an onsite green waste processing and composting operation, which is still part of the current conditional use permit for the site. The permitted volume is currently set at 560 tons per day. The City is requesting a minimum of 100 tons per day of that capacity to be set aside to accept material from the City's curbside green waste program. If the landfill allows pre- and post-consumer food waste as part of a future "mixed organic" collection program, the City is requesting an additional 20 tons per day of commercial food waste generated in the City to receive priority status as feedstock for the program. Assisting the City and local businesses with this effort will minimize the risk of organics unnecessarily being landfilled.

#### Hazards/Hazardous Materials (HM)

As a Class III disposal facility, Chiquita Canyon Landfill is prohibited from disposing of hazardous waste, sewer sludge, or radioactive waste. Inclusion of the following additional mitigation measures to provide public assurance of ongoing compliance with this prohibition is recommended.

HM1. Continue to implement a rigorous load checking program in accordance with RWQCB and the Solid Waste Facility Permit requirements to ensure no illicit hazardous materials are accepted for disposal.

#### Air Quality (AQ)

Protecting air quality from adverse impacts from landfill gasses is implemented by means of a Landfill Gas Monitoring Program, as required by the South Coast Air Quality Management

300-4

300-5

Mr. Richard Claghorn January 9, 2017 Page 3 of 5

District (SCAQMD), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and CalRecycle (formerly the California Integrated Waste Management Board). Inclusion of the following additional mitigation measures to provide public assurance of ongoing compliance with air quality requirements is recommended.

AQ1. Continue and expand the landfill gas collection system in accordance with the requirements of the SCAQMD permit, EPA New Source Performance Standards/Emission Guidelines, and Landfill Methane Capture regulations.

AQ2. Continue monthly monitoring of perimeter probes, onsite facility monitoring and landfill surface monitoring for landfill gases, and ambient air sampling at the landfill site boundaries in accordance with the approved SCAQMD Rule 1150.1 Compliance Plan, EPA Emissions Guidelines, and CalRecycle Title 27 monitoring requirements.

#### <u>The City requests further consideration and inclusion of the following comments on the</u> <u>Partially Recirculated DEIR prepared for the project also included in the letter dated October</u> <u>20, 2014</u>:

#### **Traffic and Transportation**

The traffic analysis indicates there would be a 594 truck increase in daily traffic into and out of the landfill site with the proposed expansion. This additional traffic will cause increased traffic congestion and vehicular delay for residents and employees who live and/or work in the City, based on the proposed project trip distribution of 85 percent to/from the south on Interstate 5 and seven percent to/from the east on Newhall Ranch Road. Of particular concern is the fact the majority of the projected increase in traffic will consist of trucks, which create more congestion than an equal number of smaller vehicles. In addition, 16 percent of the increased traffic is projected to occur during the peak morning commute period (6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.), which will cause increased delay for motorists traveling southbound on Interstate 5 through the Santa Clarita Valley.

Due to the projected increases in traffic and the anticipated effects, the City is requesting preferred disposal rates and priority access to the landfill to offset the anticipated effects on Santa Clarita Valley residents. In addition, the City would like the landfill operator to partner with the City to implement the annual Bike to Work Day and Rideshare events. These events aim to reduce traffic in the Santa Clarita Valley by encouraging alternative forms of transportation and carpooling. A sponsorship from the landfill in the amount of \$5,000 for each event on an annual basis would assist the City with planning and promoting the events, educating local residents, and reducing overall traffic congestion.

#### Hazards/Hazardous Materials (HM)

300-6

300-5 cont'd Mr. Richard Claghorn January 9, 2017 Page 4 of 5

HM2. Continue to implement all load checking requirements of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control and the California Department of Public Health to ensure no sewer sludge or radioactive materials are accepted for disposal.

HM3. Utilize recognized BMPs for temporary storage and handling of household hazardous waste prior to shipping materials to recycling facilities or approved hazardous waste disposal sites.

300-7

#### Landfill Operation

#### **Origin of Solid Waste**

The project proposes an increase in the amount of staffing to operate the landfill that will include additional workers at the scale house. With the increased staffing levels, the City requests all landfill customers have their full waste origin recorded, including the street name and number, city, and zip code for each load brought to the facility. Having the additional information recorded will enhance the accuracy of the waste origin. Currently, the landfill operator is recording only the jurisdiction's name.

#### **Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)**

#### Eliminate the Acceptance of Self-haul Materials from the Public

The current conditional use permit allows the landfill operator to construct a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) at the landfill site. If the operator decides to build a facility or if a local MRF is constructed in the Santa Clarita Valley, the City requests the landfill operator to be required to eliminate the acceptance of self-haul waste to increase diversion and recycling. This change in operation will reduce the possibility of waste being misallocated to the wrong jurisdiction of origin.

#### **MRF Specifications**

If the operator decides to build a facility or if a local MRF is constructed in the Santa Clarita Valley, the City further requests the MRF to include the following features:

- Transfer tipping area and load out
- Residential/commercial single stream processing system for comingled recyclables
- Commercial mixed waste sorting system
- Certified California buy-back center
- Reuse center for the public
- Minimum receiving capacity of at least 1,000 tons per day

300-8

### 300-9

300-10

Mr. Richard Claghorn January 9, 2017 Page 5 of 5

## In addition to the 2014 comments provided by staff, the City of Santa Clarita proposes for consideration and inclusion:

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change** 

The project is outside of the jurisdiction of the City and not applicable to the City's Climate Action Plan. However, the City would urge that the project meet or exceed all requirements of the Community Climate Action Plan adopted by the County of Los Angeles, as well as any and all state and/or federal laws pertaining to Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

The City appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion Project Partially Recirculated DEIR. If you have any questions, please contact me at (661) 255-4337.

Sincerely,

Environmental Services Manager

TL:CW:ll SVENISRIVS SOLWAST?/LANDFILL Clogents Clogents Conjunctionality Expansion Draft DEIR Recirculated Comments Devember 2016 doc

cc: Santa Clarita City Council Santa Clarita Planning Commission Leadership Team Rosalind Wayman, Senior Deputy, Office of Supervisor Barger Edel Vizcarra, Planning Deputy, Office of Supervisor Barger 300-11

## Letter No. 300

City of Santa Clarita Travis Lange, Environmental Services Mgr. 23920 Valencia Blvd., Ste. 300 Santa Clarita, CA 91355-2196

## Response to Comment No. 300-1

As pointed out by the City of Santa Clarita in Comment Letter 52, protection of groundwater quality is mandated by stringent Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permitting requirements. Each of the proposed mitigation measures are operating practices already required for a Class III landfill via various regulatory mechanisms and do not reflect measures needed to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Please also see Topical Response #30 for a discussion of Water Quality.

## Response to Comment No. 300-2

Please see Topical Response #13 for a discussion of the Household Hazardous Waste Facility (HHWF). The HHWF may be operated by Los Angeles County or a third party selected by the County. Exact days and hours of operation will be set by the County, but weekend operation is anticipated.

## Response to Comment No. 300-3

The Proposed Project includes a potential onsite green waste processing and composting operation, and CCL is interested in assisting the City and local businesses with efforts to minimize landfill disposal of organics.

Any discussions between CCL and the City of Santa Clarita regarding capacity set-aside for the City or priority status for the City would be conducted outside of the environmental review process for the Proposed Project.

### Response to Comment No. 300-4

The recommended mitigation measure is an operating practice already required for a Class III landfill via various regulatory mechanisms and does not reflect a measure needed to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Please also see Topical Response #29b for a discussion of the Waste Screening and Acceptance Program at CCL.

### Response to Comment No. 300-5

The recommended mitigation measures are operating practices already required for a Class III landfill via various regulatory mechanisms and do not reflect measures needed to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Please also see Topical Response #1 for a discussion of Air Quality.

## Response to Comment No. 300-6

There is no nexus between the request for preferred disposal rates and priority access to the landfill and the potential for increased traffic in the Santa Clarita Valley.

Discussions between CCL and the City of Santa Clarita regarding the provision of additional community benefits for Bike to Work Day and Rideshare events will be conducted outside of the environmental review process for the Proposed Project.

## Response to Comment No. 300-7

The recommended mitigation measures are operating practices already required for a Class III landfill via various regulatory mechanisms and do not reflect measures needed to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Please also see Topical Response #29b for a discussion of the Waste Screening and Acceptance Program at CCL.

## Response to Comment No. 300-8

Additional staff required for the Proposed Project does not include additional staffing at the scalehouse. In fact, in the future, scalehouse operations may become automated for its commercial customers, where commercial drivers gain access to the landfill via use of RFID (radio frequency identification) devices, or similar.

CCL will investigate means of acquiring the requested information from self-haulers who indicate their waste origin in the City of Santa Clarita, for use by the City of Santa Clarita, in such a way that queue time at the scalehouse is not impaired. Any means of acquiring such information must be compatible with current transaction times at the scalehouse and administrative responsibilities.

## Response to Comment No. 300-9

The Proposed Project does not include construction or operation of a Materials Recovery Facility at CCL.

To reduce the possibility of waste being misallocated to the wrong jurisdiction of origin, CCL will investigate means of acquiring the requested information from self-haulers who indicate their waste origin in the City of Santa Clarita, for use by the City of Santa Clarita, in such a way that queue time at the scalehouse is not impaired. Any means of acquiring such information must be compatible with current transaction times at the scalehouse and administrative responsibilities. "

## Response to Comment No. 300-10

The Proposed Project does not include construction or operation of a Materials Recovery Facility at CCL.

### Response to Comment No. 300-11

CCL complies with all current laws and regulations related to greenhouse gas emissions. Mitigation Measure GHG-1, which requires that CCL prepare and submit for approval a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan, which would incorporate new waste management strategies for the management of greenhouse gas emissions at CCL on a 5-year interval throughout the life of the Proposed Project.

| California Integrated Waste Management Board<br>Disposal Facility Inspection Report   |  |  |                     |             |                      |                |                        |                                    |               |                       |
|---|--|--|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| (Rov 01/07) Page <u>1 of 2</u>  |  |  |                     |             |                      |                |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| Enforcement Agency: LOS ANGELES COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT   |  |  |                     |             |                      | 12             |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| FACILITY FILE NUMBER (99-xx-999   | FACILITY FILE NUMBER (99-xx-9999) INSPECTION DATE (MM/DD/YYYY) |  |                     |             |                      |                |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| 19-AA-00  | 19 -  A  -  0  0  5  2 $0 8 /2 4 /2 0 0 9$                     |  |                     |             |                      |                |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| PROGRAM CODE (Select only one code  |  | 338 N. 189 DI                          |                     |             |                      |                |                        | X                                  |               | 2Ť                    |
| OLEA Periodic OCIWMB Closed Site  | s (  | CIWMB Focused                          | lime In;            |             | pec                  | LION           | 1 Ime                  |                                    |               |                       |
| OLEA Focused OCIWMB Enforcement Agent OCIWMB Periodic Time Out:   |  |  |                     |             |                      | )              |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| Facility Name Received By (Operator) Signature  |  |  |                     |             |                      |                |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| Facility Location   |  |  |                     |             |                      |                |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| 29201 HENRY MAYO DR., VALENCIA CA   |  |  |                     |             |                      |                |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| CASTELLANOS   |  |  |                     |             |                      |                |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| THE ABOVE FACALITY WAS INSPECTED FOR COMPLIANCE   | E WITH APPL  | CABLE SECTIONS OF DIVISI               | ON 30 OF THE PUBLIC | ESOURCES C  | ODE (                | PRC), A        | NO TITLE, 14 A         | C TITLE 27 CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGU | AATIONS (CCR) | 61                    |
| PERMITS   | VA   | SPREADING/COMPA                        | CTING               | EDWINON     |                      | A              | CONTROL                | VEVIOLATION AFAREA OF CONC         |               | A                     |
| PRC 44004(a) - SIGNIFICANT CHANGE   | 100  | 20540 - SPREADINGA                     | COMPACTING          |             |                      |                |                        | ISE CONTROL                        | 0             | Ô                     |
| PRC 44014(b) - OPERATOR COMPLIES WITH TERMS   | 00   | 20850 - GRADING OF                     | FILL SURFACES       |             | Õ                    | Ō              | 20860 - TR             | AFFIC CONTROL                      |               | Õ                     |
| AND CONDITIONS OF PERMIT  |  | 20560 - STOCKPILING                    | 3                   |             | Õ                    | Õ              | 20870 - HA             | ZARDOUS WASTES                     | Ō             | Õ                     |
| 21640 - REVIEW OF PERMITS   |  | DAILY & INTERMEDIA                     | TE COVER            |             |                      |                | 20580 - ME             | DICAL WASTES                       | Ō             | Õ                     |
| 21600 - REPORT OF DISP SITE INFORMATION   | 00   | 20570 - AVAILABILITY                   | OF COVER MATER      | IAL I       |                      | $\bigcirc$     | 20890 - DE             | AD ANIMALS                         | 0             | Ō                     |
| LOCATION RESTRICTIONS   | 1  | 20580 - DAILY COVER                    | <u>،</u>            |             | õ                    | õ              | 20900 - AIR            | CRITERIA                           |               | õ                     |
| 20270 - AIRPORT SAFETY  | 00   | 20590 - ALTERNATIVE                    | DAILY COVER         |             | ŏ                    | Õ.             | GAS MONI               | TORING & CONTROL                   |               | 24                    |
| OPERATING CRITERIA  |  | 20895 - PERFORMAN                      | CE STANDARDS        |             | õ                    | õ              | 20918 - EX             | EMPTIONS                           | 10            | $\overline{O}$        |
| 20510 - DISPOSAL SITE RECORDS   | 00   | 20700 - INTERMEDIAT                    | E COVER             |             | ŏ                    | ŏ              | 20919 - GA             | S CONTROL                          |               | ň                     |
| 20515 - MSWLF UNIT RECORDS  | <u>õð</u>  | 20686 - BENEFICIAL P                   | REUSE               |             | ŏ                    | ŏ.             | 20918.5 - E            | XPLOSIVE GAS CONTROL               |               | ð                     |
| 20517 - DOCUMENT APPROVALS/REQUIREMENTS   | 15151  | HANDLING, EQUIPME                      | ENT & MAINTENANO    |             |                      | $\sim$         | CLOSURE                |                                    |               | $\ge$                 |
| 20520 - SIGNS   | 100  | 20710 - SCAVENGING                     | SALVAGING/STOR      | AGE         | $\cap$               | $\overline{O}$ | 21110-TIN              | E FRAMES FOR CLOSURE               | 0             | $\overline{a}$        |
| 20530 - SITE SECURITY   | 100  | 20720 - NON-SALVAGEABLE ITEMS          |                     |             |                      | ŏ              | 21760 - 50             | BMITTAL CLOSURE PLANS              |               | ŏ                     |
| 20540 - ROADS   | 1010   | 20730 - VOLUME REDUCTION/ENERGY RECOVE |                     |             | ň                    | ŏ              | TIRES                  |                                    |               | $\sim$                |
| 20550 - SANITARY FACILITIES   | 1010   | 20740 - EQUIPMENT                      |                     |             |                      | ŏ              | 17351 - FIR            | E PREVENTION MEASURES              |               | $\overline{\bigcirc}$ |
| 20560 - DRINKING WATER SUPPLY   | ŏŏ   | 2 20750 - SITE MAINTENANCE             |                     |             |                      |                | CILITY ACCESS SECURITY |                                    | ă             |                       |
| 20570 - COMMUNICATION FACILITIES  | <u> TOTO</u>   | CONTROLS                               |                     |             |                      |                | 17353 - VE             | CTOR CONTROL                       |               | Ħ                     |
| 20580 - LIGHTING  | õð   | 20760 - NUISANCE CO                    | ONTROL              |             |                      |                |                        | DRAGE                              |               | ă                     |
| PERSONNEL   | 20770 - ANIMAL FEEDING   |  |                     | ă           | ŏ                    | 17355 - DIS    | POSAL                  |                                    | Ħ             |                       |
| 20590 - PERSONNEL HEALTH & SAFETY   |  | 20780 - OPEN BURNING BURNING WASTES    |                     |             | ŏ                    | Ы.             | 17356 - INDOOR STORAGE |                                    |               |                       |
| 20510 - TRAINING  | <u>ăă</u>  | 20790 - LEACHATE CONTROL               |                     |             | $\widetilde{\frown}$ |                |                        |                                    |               | Ξ                     |
| 20615 - SUPERVISION   | <u> K</u>  | 2000 - DUST CONTROL                    |                     |             | X                    | 치              | 20921(b                | GAS MONITORING AND                 |               | 허                     |
| 20620 - SITE ATTENDANT  | 66   | 20810 - VECTOR AND                     | BIRD CONTROL        |             | X                    | ×.             |                        |                                    |               | 케                     |
| CONFINED UNLOADING  |  | 20820 - DRAINAGE & EPOSION CONTROL     |                     |             | X                    | ×.             | i                      |                                    |               | 爿                     |
| 20530 - CONFINED UNLOADING  | 20530 - LITTER CONTROL   |  |                     | ŏ           | ŏ.                   | }              |                        | - 80                               | X             |                       |
| Comments: (Note: for additional or contin   | nued con   | ments use the CIV                      | MB 03 or attack     | 1 additions | al pa                | ges.)          |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| HOURS OF OPERATIONS FROM 4:30AM TO 5:00PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY, SATURDAYS FROM 4:30AM TO 2:00PM, PERMITTED<br>TONNAGE IS 6000 TPD, DAILY PEAK TONNAGE 1,500TPD.<br>PERIMETER PROBES 5,6,7,9 and A CHECKED FOR METHANE, NO METHANE DETECTED AT THESE PROBES.<br>GAS LIKE ODOR PROBLEM AT CELL 3-5 HAS BEEN CORRECTED.<br>THE FOLLOWING RECORDS WERE CHECKED AND FOUND SATISFACTORY: LOAD CHECKS, SAFETY MEETINGS, TONNAGE, DAILY AND<br>SPECIAL OCCURRANCES AND COMPLAINTS. NO ODOR COMPLAINTS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED SINCE LAST INSPECTION.<br>BIRD AND DUST CONTROL SATISFACTORY.<br>NO EROSION OBSERVED. LANDFILL STAFF IS TAKING ALL NECESSARY MEASURES TO CONTROL LITTER INSIDE THE LANDFILL. LITTER<br>WAS OBSERVED ON SLOPES BUT IT IS COLLECTED ON A DAILY BASIS ALONG THE FENCES AT WORKING FACE AREA.<br>NO LITTER OBSERVED ON HWY 126 AND STREET SWEEPER WAS IN OPERATION.<br>LIGHTING DURING DARK HOURS WAS SATISFACTORY AND NO TRASH /ODOR DETECTED IN THE VALVERDE AREA.<br>GREEN WASTE PILES ARE NOT MIXED AND ARE REMOVED ON A DAILY BASIS.<br>GRADING HAS COMMENCED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WASTE TO ENERGY PLANT. DUST CONTROL AT THIS AREA |  |  |                     |             |                      |                |                        |                                    |               |                       |
| INSTRUCTIONS ON BA  | ск 🧯   | orrecten Inc                           | ofrect: Q           | D S         |                      | X              | AMP                    | LE 123                             |               |                       |
|   | Top Whi  | ite – CIWMB                            | Middle Pink -       | LEA         | 1                    | Botto          | m - Yellow             | ł                                  |               |                       |

#### CIWMB Form 52 - Disposal Facility Inspection Report Enforcement Agency: LOS ANGELES COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Page 2 of 2

Facility Name: CHIQUITA CYN LANDFILL

Facility File Number: 19-AA-0052

Inspection Date: 08/24/2009

## Comments Continued:

DURING THE MONTH OF AUGUST TWO RADIOACTIVE LOADS WERE DETECTED. LANDFILL STAFF REPORTED THE INCIDENTS TO RADIATION MANAGEMENT .

**REMINDERS:** 

AS OF TODAY, THE LEA HAS NOT RECEIVED THE 45 DAY OWNER/OPERATOR TRANSFER NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH TITLE 27 SECTION 21630. A DRAFT LETTER FROM JIM LITTLE WAS SUBMITTED TO THE CIWMB. A LETTER WITH ALL PERTINENT DOCUMENTS REQUIRED BY THIS SECTION NEED TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE LEA AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. SEVERAL VERBAL ATTEMPTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO THE LANDFILL SITE MANAGER, MIKE DEAN AND TO JIM LITTLE AND STILL WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED ANY DOCUMENTS.

AS THE WET WEATHER SEASON APPROACHES, ENSURE ALL DITCHES, ROADS, DRAINS AND SLOPES ARE PREPARED FOR THISS CONDITIONS.

ORGANIC SOULTIONS IS NO LONGER CONDUCTING COMPOSTING OPERATIONS AT CHIQUITA CANYON.

I support the master plan revisions and want to keep the landfill open! I am a Val Verde resident and I am a Val Verde resident and VAL VERDE VAL VERDE 2 Name Iplease printil 140 Phone number Signature Alex Tab 15 Suggested arts 11 merum Apps 🛐 (BS) Facebook

## CalRecycle Disposal Facility Inspection Report (52)

| Enf                                    | orce       | ment Agency: County of Los Angeles  |                |  |
|--|------------|---|----------------|--|
| SW                                     | IS Fa      | acility File Number (99-xx-9999)  | The Part       | Inspection Date  |
|  |            | 19-AA-0052  |                | 2/19/2013  |
| X LEA Periodic CalRecycle Closed Sites |            |   |                | CalRecycle Focused   |
|  | LE/        | A Focused CalRecycle Enforcement Agent  | (              | CalRecycle Periodic  |
| Ins                                    | pecti      | on Time In  |                | Time Out   |
| Fac                                    | ility      | Name  | Re             | ceived By  |
| Ch                                     | iqui       | ta Canyon Sanitary Landfill   | Ch             | iquita Canyon, Inc.  |
| Fac                                    | ility      | Location  | Ow             | ner Name   |
| 292<br>913                             | 201<br>384 | Henry Mayo Drive, Castaic   |                |  |
| Ins                                    | pect       | D <b>r</b>  | Als            | o Present (Name)   |
| CA                                     | STE        | ELLANOS   |                |  |
| THE AL                                 | OVE FAI    | CILITY WAS INSPECTED FOR COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF DIVISION 30 OF PUBLIC | RESOURCES COOL | (PRC) AND TITLE 14 AND TITLE 27 CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR) |
| Х                                      | No \       | Violations or Areas of Concern  |                |  |
| V                                      | A          | Tires   | Comme          | nts  |
|  |            | 17355 - Disposal  | -              |  |
|  |            | 17352 - Facility Access and Security  |                |  |
|  |            | 17356 - Indoor Storage  | = ==           |  |
|  |            | 17353 - Vector Control Measures   |                |  |
|  |            | 17354 - Storage   |                |  |
|  |            | 17351 - Fire Prevention   |                |  |
| ۷                                      | A          | Closure   | Comme          | nts  |
|  |            | 21780 - Closure Plan  |                |  |
|  |            | 21110 - Time Frame for Closure  |                |  |
|  |            | 21860(f) - Schedule Review/Approval C/PC<br>Plans                                     | =              |  |
| V                                      | A          | Handling Equipment & Maintenance  | Comme          | nts  |
|  |            | 20740 - Equipment   |                |  |
|  |            | 20710 - Scavenging / Salvaging / Storage  |                |  |
|  |            | 20720 - Non-Salvageable Items   |                |  |
|  |            | 20750 - Site Maintenance  |                |  |
|  | =          | 20730 - Volume Reduction/Energy<br>Recovery   |                |  |
| V                                      | A          | Confined Unloading  | Comme          | nts  |
|  |            | 20630 - Confined Unloading  |                |  |
| ۷                                      | Α          | Controls  | Comme          | nts  |
|  |            | 20860 - Traffic Control   |                |  |
|  |            | 20820 - Drainage and Erosion Control  |                |  |
|  |            | 20890 - Dead Animals  | _              |  |
|  |            | 20800 - Dust Control  |                |  |
|  |            | 20830 - Litter Control  |                |  |
|  |            | 20900 - Air Criteria  |                |  |
|  |            | 20770 - Animal Feeding  |                |  |
|  |            | 20870 - Hazardous Wastes  |                |  |
|   |           | 20780 - Open Burning / Burning Wastes                            |          |
|---|-----------|--|----------|
|   |           | 20810 - Vector and Bird Control                                  |          |
|   |           | 20880 - Medical Wastes   |          |
|   |           | 20840 - Noise Control  |          |
|   |           | 20760 - Nuisance Control   |          |
|   |           | 20790 - Leachate Control   |          |
| ۷ | A         | Operating Criteria   | Comments |
|   |           | 20550 - Sanitary Facilities                                      |          |
|   |           | 20510 - Disposal Site Records                                    |          |
|   |           | 20520 - Signs  |          |
|   |           | 20580 - Lighting   |          |
|   |           | 20515 - MSWLF Unit Records                                       |          |
|   |           | 20530 - Site Security  |          |
|   |           | 20560 - Drinking Water Supply                                    |          |
|   |           | 20570 - Communications Facilities                                |          |
|   |           | 20517 - Document Approvals /                                     |          |
|   |           | Requirements   |          |
|   |           | 20540 - Roads  |          |
| V | A         | Gas Monitoring & Control   | Comments |
|   |           | 20934 - Reporting  |          |
|   |           | 20918 - Exemptions   |          |
|   |           | 20933 - Monitoring Frequency                                     |          |
|   |           | 20931 - Structure Monitoring                                     |          |
|   |           | 20932 - Monitored Parameters                                     |          |
|   |           | 20939 - Control Excessive Gas<br>Concentrations                  |          |
|   |           | 20923 - Gas Monitoring   |          |
|   |           | 20919 - Gas Control  |          |
|   |           | 20925 - Perimeter Monitoring Network                             |          |
|   |           | 20921 - Gas Monitoring and Control                               |          |
|   |           | 20937 - Reporting and Control of Excessive<br>Gas Concentrations |          |
|   |           | 20919.5 - Explosive Gas Control                                  |          |
| V | A         | Permits  | Comments |
|   |           | PRC 44014(b) - Operator Complies with<br>Terms & Conditions      |          |
|   |           | PRC 44002 - Operator Authorized by SWF<br>Permit                 |          |
| - | 1         | PRC 44004(a) - Significant Change                                |          |
|   | $\square$ | 21640 - Title 27 Full permit review                              |          |
| - |           | 21600 - Report of Disposal Site Information                      |          |
| V | A         | Spreading/Compacting   | Comments |
|   |           | 20660 - Stockpiling  |          |
|   |           | 20640 - Spreading/Compacting                                     |          |
|   |           | 20650 - Grading of Fill Surfaces                                 |          |
| V | A         | Daily & Intermediate Cover                                       | Comments |
|   |           | 20670 - Availability Cover Material                              |          |
|   |           | 20690 - Alternative Daily Cover                                  |          |
|   |           | 20700 - Intermediate Cover                                       |          |

|   |   | 20695 - Performance Standards       |          |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|----------|
|   |   | 20680 - Daily Cover                 |          |
|   |   | 20686 - Beneficial ReUse            |          |
| V | Α | Personnel                           | Comments |
|   |   | 20615 - Supervision                 |          |
|   |   | 20590 - Personnel Health and Safety |          |
|   |   | 20620 - Site Attendant              |          |
|   |   | 20610 - Training                    |          |
| V | Α | Location Restrictions               | Comments |
|   |   | 20270 - Airport Safety              |          |

Comments:

HOURS OF OPERATIONS FROM 4:30AM TO 5:00PM MONDAY. TUESDAY THROUGH FRIDAY 3:00AM TO 5:00PM. SATURDAYS FROM 4:30AM TO 2:00PM. PERMITTED TONNAGE IS 6000 TPD. DAILY PEAK DISPOSAL TONNAGE AVERAGE IS 3,400 TPD.

THE FOLLOWING PERIMETER GAS PROBES WERE READ AND NO METHANE GAS WAS DETECTED: 5, 7, 9,11 AND 23.

THE FOLLOWING RECORDS WERE CHECKED AND FOUND IN COMPLIANCE: LOAD CHECKS, SAFETY TRAINING, COMPLAINTS AND TONNAGE REPORT.

A VALVERDE COMMUNITY SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED BY THE LEA IN THE MORNING AND AFTERNOON AND NO ODORS WERE DETECTED. NO LITTER OBSERVED ALONG CHIQUITO CANYON ROAD. STEVE CASULO REPORTED A TRUCK THAT TRIGGERED THE RADIATION ALARM. RADIATION MANAGEMENT HAS BEEN CONTACTED.

SLOPE MAINTENANCE IS SATISFACTORY, NO EXPOSED TRASH OBSERVED. DUST CONTROL SATISFACTORY. BIRD CONTROL SATISFACTORY. NO LITTER OBSERVED ON HWY 126 AND STREET SWEEPER WAS IN OPERATION.

TRASH DISPOSAL CONTINUES AT NEW CELL. LIGHTING DURING DARK HOURS WAS SATISFACTORY AND SIGNS ARE PROVIDED FOR ADEQUATE TRAFFIC FLOW.

ADVISED OPERATOR TO ENSURE ADEQUATE COVER MATERIAL IS APPLIED AT THE HAND LOADS DISPOSAL AREA AT THE END OF THE DAY. SOME LARGE OBJECTS WERE SEEN STICKING OUT OF THE COVER.

NO SIGNIFICANT VIOLATIONS OBSERVED AT THE TIME OF INSPECTION



# **Richard Claghorn**

| Susie Evans <sheffs@pacbell.net></sheffs@pacbell.net>             |
|---|
| Monday, April 03, 2017 6:31 PM                                    |
| Rosie Ruiz; Richard Claghorn                                      |
| Letter of Opposition to Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion        |
| ChiquitaOppositionLetterforDRPCommissioners 4-3-2017 emailed.docx |
|   |

Please forward to all Planning Commissioners listed below as well as all five LA County Board of Supervisors

Supervisorial District 1: Doug Smith, Chair Supervisorial District 2: David W. Louie, Vice Chair Supervisorial District 3: Laura Shell, Commissioner Supervisorial District 4: Elvin W. Moon, Commissioner Supervisorial District 5: Pat Modugno, Commissioner

Susan M. Evans 29830 Lincoln Ave. Val Verde, CA 91384 Home 661-702-9782 Cell 661-433-1380 Email Sheffs@pacbell.net Dear LA County Regional Planning Commissioners:

I am writing to express my personal opposition for Chiquita Canyon Landfill's FEIR for The Master Plan Revision. This is an inadequate and unnecessary plan for the landfill.

As a resident, I recognize that Chiquita Canyon has been too close to nearby communities for more than four decades, and plays a big role in the decline of air quality of the Santa Clarita Valley. This is especially important considering that its expansion would make the air quality and traffic in the SCV much worse, all while communities continue to be built nearby.

In looking at the DEIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon has not carefully considered the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. The report states that daily emissions of PM2.5 (dust particles) from construction and operation would **exceed the Air Quality Management District threshold** and that even with additional mitigation, PM2.5 would **"remain potentially significant and unavoidable**." (ES.6.8, Air Quality).

Aside from the issues surrounding the PM2.5 levels, there is no local data for Hydrogen Sulfide and Vinyl Chloride levels for the landfill in the report. Hydrogen Sulfide odor above 30 ppm is described as sweet or sickeningly sweet often the smell residents have reported smelling from the landfill site [https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/hydrogensulfide/hazards.html]. At your 2014 hearing on the expansion residents testified to having symptoms of Hydrogen Sulfide poisoning including nausea, headaches, burning eyes and airway problems. One resident in his testimony described the symptoms as "It's like someone's choking me." Until there is more data on air quality and health conditions in Val Verde and surrounding areas this project must not be approved.

The landfill is also ignoring their contract with the nearby community of Val Verde – something I feel is unacceptable, and sets further precedent for broken promises to the SCV, much to the ongoing frustration of area residents.

Over the years, Chiquita Canyon has been caught taking in sludge (which is not permitted there), in addition to numerous violations in regard to its smell. This reflects the site's inability to manage itself at its current size, much less at double its size. To me it is like asking the Fox to guard the henhouse.

The environmental report also states "...cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase **cancer risk** by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a *significant cumulative impact*." The cancer risk is at 15 which is 5 above the threshold. (11.9.2.3, Health Impacts) I urge the Commission to look forward to a different waste plan to help protect the citizens of the Santa Clarita Valley by considering

the amount of people that are poised to live in its wake, as well as the 13,000 children that currently attend school as close as 0.8 miles away from the project.

As a result, I am adamantly opposed to the findings of the FEIR and the Master Plan Revision, and recommend finding a new way. Please close Chiquita Landfill as scheduled back in 1997.

Sincerely, Susan M. Evans 29830 Lincoln Ave. Val Verde, CA 91384 <u>Sheffs@pacbell.net</u> Home 661-702-9782 Cell 661-433-1380

### **Richard Claghorn**

| From:        | Susie Evans <sheffs@pacbell.net></sheffs@pacbell.net>      |
|--------------|--|
| Sent:        | Monday, April 03, 2017 6:31 PM                             |
| То:          | Rosie Ruiz; Richard Claghorn                               |
| Subject:     | Letter of Opposition to Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion |
| Attachments: | ChiquitaOppositionLetterforDRPCommissioners 4-3-2017.docx  |

Please forward the following people this email

Supervisorial District 1: Doug Smith, Chair Supervisorial District 2: David W. Louie, Vice Chair Supervisorial District 3: Laura Shell, Commissioner Supervisorial District 4: Elvin W. Moon, Commissioner Supervisorial District 5: Pat Modugno, Commissioner Dear LA County Regional Planning Commissioners:

I am writing to express my personal opposition for Chiquita Canyon Landfill's FEIR for The Master Plan Revision. This is an inadequate and unnecessary plan for the landfill.

As a resident, I recognize that Chiquita Canyon has been too close to nearby communities for more than four decades, and plays a big role in the decline of air quality of the Santa Clarita Valley. This is especially important considering that its expansion would make the air quality and traffic in the SCV much worse, all while communities continue to be built nearby.

In looking at the DEIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon has not carefully considered the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. The report states that daily emissions of PM2.5 (dust particles) from construction and operation would *exceed the Air Quality Management District threshold* and that even with additional mitigation, PM2.5 would *"remain potentially significant and unavoidable."* (ES.6.8, Air Quality).

Aside from the issues surrounding the PM2.5 levels, there is no local data for Hydrogen Sulfide and Vinyl Chloride levels for the landfill in the report. Hydrogen Sulfide odor above 30 ppm is described as sweet or sickeningly sweet often the smell residents have reported smelling from the landfill site [https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/hydrogensulfide/hazards.html]. At your 2014 hearing on the expansion residents testified to having symptoms of Hydrogen Sulfide poisoning including nausea, headaches, burning eyes and airway problems. One resident in his testimony described the symptoms as "It's like someone's choking me." Until there is more data on air quality and health conditions in Val Verde and surrounding areas this project must not be approved.

The landfill is also ignoring their contract with the nearby community of Val Verde – something I feel is unacceptable, and sets further precedent for broken promises to the SCV, much to the ongoing frustration of area residents.

Over the years, Chiquita Canyon has been caught taking in sludge (which is not permitted there), in addition to numerous violations in regard to its smell. This reflects the site's inability to manage itself at its current size, much less at double its size. To me it is like asking the Fox to guard the henhouse.

The environmental report also states "...cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase cancer risk by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a *significant cumulative impact*." The cancer risk is at 15 which is 5 above the threshold. (11.9.2.3, Health Impacts) I urge the Commission to look forward to a different waste plan to help protect the citizens of the Santa Clarita Valley by considering the amount of people that are poised to live in its wake, as well as the 13,000 children that currently attend school as close as 0.8 miles away from the project.

As a result, I am adamantly opposed to the findings of the FEIR and the Master Plan Revision, and recommend finding a new way. Please close Chiquita Landfill as scheduled back in 1997.

Sincerely,

# Fwd: Chiquita Canyon Landfill - Task Force's Comments on the Final EIR

| RB                     | Richard Bruckner<br>Today, 10:30 AM<br>Samuel Dea; Richard Clay | ghorn ౪      |                                   | ġ. | ℅ Reply all ↓             |
|------------------------|---|--------------|-----------------------------------|----|---------------------------|
| Inbox                  |   |              |                                   |    |                           |
| ES CO<br>FE Mi<br>D Wi | DUNTY<br>ANAGEME<br>ASTE MAN/                                   |              |                                   |    |                           |
|                        | ATT00001.htm<br>4 KB  | ~            | ChiquitaCanyonLandfillT<br>294 KB | ~  | ATT00002.htm<br>461 bytes |
| <b>ö</b> Show a        | ll 4 attachments (389 KB)                                       | Download all |                                   |    |                           |
|                        |   |              |                                   |    |                           |

Richard J. Bruckner Director Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 (213) 974-6401

Begin forwarded message:

From: Taskforce <<u>taskforce@dpw.lacounty.gov</u>> Date: April 4, 2017 at 10:29:43 AM PDT To: Richard Claghorn <<u>rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov</u>> Cc: Dan Lafferty <<u>DLAFF@dpw.lacounty.gov</u>>, Carlos Ruiz <<u>CARUIZ@dpw.lacounty.gov</u>>, Bahman Hajialiakbar <<u>BHAJI@dpw.lacounty.gov</u>>, "<u>mikemohajer@yahoo.com</u>" <<u>mikemohajer@yahoo.com</u>> Subject: Chiquita Canyon Landfill - Task Force's Comments on the Final EIR



×



LOS ANGELES COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE/ INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE 900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE, ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331 P.O. BOX 1460, ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460 www.lacountyiswmtf.org

April 4, 2017

MARGARET CLARK, VICE - CHAIR

Mr. Richard Claghorn County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning Zoning Permits North Section, Room 1348 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Claghorn:

### COMMENTS ON FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT - CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL - SCH No. 2005081071 - MASTER PLAN REVISION PROJECT NO.: R2004-00559-(5)

The Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/Integrated Waste Management Task Force (Task Force) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision, Project No. R2004-00559-(5), which was released to the public on February 16, 2017, and the following comments are offered:

### **Chapter 1: Introduction**

In section 1.4, Project Need, the Task Force has previously provided comments on this section during the initial release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) 2014 and subsequently in 2017during the partial recirculation of the DEIR. The provided comments requested for in-depth discussions to substantiate the need for the expansion of the existing Chiquita Canyon Landfill (Landfill) taking into consideration the potential impacts on the Project Need from various legislative proposals specially SB 32 and SB 1383 (2016). Based on the FEIR, the Task Force believes the environmental document has not adequately addressed the issues. SB 32, among other things, requires landfill GHG emission to be reduced to 60% of the year 1990 level by 2030. Further, the newly enacted SB 1383, among other GHG reductions, requires all jurisdictions in California to reduce the amount of organic waste landfilled by 75% by the year 2025 as compared to the amount disposed of in 2014. This comment needs to be fully addressed in the FEIR.

### Mr. Richard Claghorn April 4, 2017 Page 2

Similarly, the Task Force, in its 2014 and 2017 letters, has previously requested the environmental document to incorporate a detailed discussion in this Chapter as how the proposed Project would meet the siting criteria as specified in the June 1997 Los Angeles County Countywide Siting Element (Volume I – The Element, Chapter 6, Facility Siting Criteria). This comment is yet to be addressed as well. The Siting Element Document was set up to ensure jurisdictions in Los Angeles County have adequate disposal capacity to manage their waste disposal needs. It also ensures the identified facilities are safely operated and appropriated sited under the required siting criteria. Thus, it is crucial for the environmental document to discuss and provide details how these criteria were met. The information would allow the residents as well and responsible agencies to make an informed decision about the project.

### Chapter 2: Project Description

 The FEIR needs to specify the locations of any potential long term soil stockpile areas including the duration of the stockpiles at those locations. Stock piling locations are important information to be identified along with all mitigation measures such as dust and erosion control. This comment needs to be fully addressed in the FEIR.

### Chapter 11.1 Air Quality

Section 11.4.3 Local Regulations and Standards – Since FEIR identified that peeling back of previous day's cover would be a standard operating procedure at the Landfill, this Section should be expanded and elaborated on how odors will be managed and contained during the peeling back process. The provided response to address this matter is insufficient as it did not explain what procedures will be considered to control the odor emitting from the peeling back process. Considering odor nuisance has significant impacts to the surrounding community, this topic needs to be fully addressed in the Final EIR.

### **Chapter 18: Project Alternatives**

• Environmental Analysis 18.3.2.6 (Pg. 18-16). The conclusion provided under Visual Resources Section states that "[visual] *Impacts would be less than significant*". The provided response is contradicting with the provided visual simulations in Figures 18-3, 18-4, 18-8,18-9 18-13 and 18-14. The visual simulation demonstrated that the landfill would substantially be increasing in height and the surrounding community such as the residents located at North and East of Hasley Canyon Road would have a clear view of the landfill. It is clear that the

Mr. Richard Claghorn April 4, 2017 Page 3

impact is significant and unavoidable. This conclusion to this section needs to be amended.

As provided by Chapter 3.67 of the Los Angeles County Code and the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939 [AB 939], as amended), the Task Force is responsible for coordinating the development of all major solid waste planning documents prepared for the County of Los Angeles and the 88 cities in Los Angeles County. Consistent with these responsibilities and to ensure a coordinated, cost-effective, and environmentally-sound solid waste management system in Los Angeles County, the Task Force also addresses issues impacting the system on a Countywide basis. The Task Force membership includes representatives of the League of California Cities-Los Angeles County Division, County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, City of Los Angeles, the waste management industry, environmental groups, the public, and a number of other governmental agencies.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Mike Mohajer of the Task Force at <u>MikeMohajer@yahoo.com</u> or (909) 592-1147.

Sincerely,

Margaret Clark

Margaret Clark, Vice Chair Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Committee/ Integrated Waste Management Task Force and Council Member, City of Rosemead

ND:kk

P:\eppub\EnvAff\EA\TF\TF\Letters\2017\April\ChiquitaCanyonLandfillTFComments.docx

cc: Each Member of the County of Los Angeles Regional Planning Commission County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning (Richard Bruckner) Each Member of the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force Each Member of the Facility & Planning Review Subcommittee

My letter

| あ Reply all   ~           面 Delete Junk   ~ •••   |  |
|---|--|
| My letter   | ÷.                                       |
| AW Anne marie Whalley <poupettelafleur@yahoo.com> Today, 11:24 AM Richard Claghorn \$</poupettelafleur@yahoo.com>   | ♦   Reply all                            |
| Inbox   |  |
| Action Items  |  |
| Bonjour Ricahrd:<br>It seems that my letter has not been provided to the EIR.<br>I have not seen the comments yet, and those are important to me. Could you send me the commend<br>My address is:<br>Anne Marie Whalley<br>18724 Nathan Hill Drive<br>Santa Clarita, CA 91351<br>I haven't yet bought a new printer.<br>Could you also, as soon as possible, post my questions on the EIR ?<br>When people tell me that my questions are going to be answered and posted, I believe them. That<br>Thank you, and have a great week.<br>Anne Marie Whalley<br>661-250-1441 | ents via mail?<br>t's what I call trust. |

A Reply all 
 A mathematical mat

My letter

### **Richard Claghorn**

From: Sent: To: Subject: Richard Claghorn Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:32 PM 'Anne marie Whalley' RE: My letter

Hello Anne Marie,

I will mail you a copy of the response letter. Your letter and response will also be posted on our website as part of the supplemental hearing package for the April 19 hearing. It will likely be posted on April 6. Thanks.

Richard Claghorn Principal Regional Planning Assistant Zoning Permits North Section Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street, Room 1348 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Phone: 213-974-6443

From: Anne marie Whalley [mailto:poupettelafleur@yahoo.com] Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 11:24 AM To: Richard Claghorn <rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov> Subject: My letter

Bonjour Ricahrd: It seems that my letter has not been provided to the EIR. I have not seen the comments yet, and those are important to me. Could you send me the comments via mail? My address is: Anne Marie Whalley 18724 Nathan Hill Drive Santa Clarita, CA 91351 I haven't yet bought a new printer. Could you also, as soon as possible, post my questions on the EIR ? When people tell me that my questions are going to be answered and posted, I believe them. That's what I call trust. Thank you, and have a great week. Anne Marie Whalley 661-250-1441

1

## **Richard Claghorn**

| From:    | Tre Conway <trelaporte75@yahoo.com></trelaporte75@yahoo.com>  |
|----------|---|
| Sent:    | Tuesday, April 04, 2017 9:57 PM   |
| To:      | Richard Claghorn; Rosie Ruiz; executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov |
| Cc:      | Julie Olsen   |
| Subject: | Opposing the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion   |

Dear LA County Planning,

I am writing you to share the concern I have over the pending Chiquita Canyon Landfill expansion and request you to submit a letter opposition before the April 19th hearing on the project.

Here are few reasons I am making this request:

- Our school, Charles Helmers Elementary, is within 5 miles of the expansion border.
- •
- An expansion would double the amount of trash taken in at Chiquita, adding to already poor air quality and bad traffic throughout the SCV.

•

- CCL's environmental report states that daily emissions of PM2.5 (particulate matter that enters the lungs) from construction and operation would *exceed the Air Quality Management District threshold* and that even with additional mitigation, PM2.5 would *"remain potentially significant and unavoidable."* (ES.6.8, Air Quality)
- Health problems would include eye, nose, throat and lung irritation; coughing; shortness of breath; and intensified asthma and heart disease. Scientific studies link increases in PM2.5 exposure with increased respiratory and cardiovascular hospital admissions, ER visits and deaths.

•

• The environmental report also states "...cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase **cancer risk** by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a *significant cumulative impact*." The cancer risk is at 15 which is 5 above the threshold. (11.9.2.3, Health Impacts)

•

- Schools: The nearest school is .8 miles away, and more than 13,000 children will be going to school or preschool within 5 miles or less of the landfill expansion border. Students at Van Gogh Elementary are 2 miles from Sunshine Canyon Landfill and despite filters to mitigate landfill odors, the odors still seep into classrooms and hang over the schoolyard.
- **Businesses:** The nearest commercial business is 500 feet away, with *the Valencia Commerce Center* being within 1 mile, a business park where landfill odors are already detected.
- Truck traffic headed to CCL will increase by more than 500 trucks per day coming from outside the SCV, affecting the commute of thousands of Santa Clarita Valley and Castaic residents who travel the I-5 and 126 freeways

The possibilities are unacceptable and put our children at risk. Therefore, I am submitting this letter opposing the landfill expansion.

Sincerely,

Tre' Conway Helmers PTA President

Sent from my iPhone

.

### **Richard Claghorn**

| From:<br>Sept: | Rebecca Swint <rebecca.swint@gmail.com><br/>Wednesday_April 05_2017_11:40_AM</rebecca.swint@gmail.com> |
|----------------|--|
| To.            | Richard Clachorn: Rosie Ruiz: executiveoffice@bos lacounty.gov   |
| Cc:            | kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; sheila@bos.lacounty.gov;                    |
|                | markridley-thomas@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov                                     |
| Subject:       | Concerned SCV Citizen Opposed to Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion                                    |

Hello Richard, Rosie & Kenneth, et al,

I am a longtime resident of Santa Clarita (since 1997), and a homeowner living in Saugus since 2004. I worked for 12 years at Arvato Bertelsmann, which is on Commerce Center Drive, less than a mile from Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

I live, work, vote & pay taxes in this city. I'm also a parent to two elementary school children who go to school in the Saugus Union School District, less than 10 miles from the dump. I am strongly opposed to the proposed expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. I've personally witnessed the increased pollution and trash truck traffic in our city over the last decade+, and how it damages our roads & our health.

Santa Clarita has been a great place to live. The residents here affectionately refer to it as "awesometown." We are known for Magic Mountain, our Paseos, and the clean image our town projects. Expanding this landfill will make us notable for a different reason: We would be the new home to the biggest landfill in the nation. This is not an honor I want for our town.

Please don't trash our town.

We've already invested our tax dollars in the alternative solution of sending the trash by rail to the Mojave landfill. Please, I urge you to pursue this alternative.

Thank you for your time in reading my concern. I hope you will do the right thing and not allow the Chiquita Canyon Landfill to break its promise to close in 2019.

Kind regards,

Rebecca Swint Santa Clarita, CA

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

# **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future. A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

John J Dortet

John Dorch

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup>
 District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District
 Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup>
 District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District
 Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

# WEST RANCH TOWN COUNCIL

February 06, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Dae:

I'm writing on behalf of the West Ranch Town Council, and a 30-year local resident, in support of the Chiquita Canyon Expansion. Chiquita Canyon has built a reputation for handling the area's solid waste needs in an environmentally conscientious manner, monitoring environmental and related impacts to ensure the Valley's natural resources are protected.

I believe that there is one thing that we can all agree on. Our trash needs to go somewhere, and if people don't want the landfill then people need to stop creating trash. They have been providing an important service to the homes and businesses in the Valley and this expansion will ensure that the landfill can continue to responsibly meet solid waste needs.

The Council believes that the Partial Recirculated Draft EIR addresses community concerns and that the expansion of Chiquita Canyon is in the best interest of the unincorporated Los Angeles communities (Sunset Pointe, Southern Oaks, Stevenson Ranch, and Westridge) represented by the West Ranch Town Council.

In looking at the Partial Recirculated Draft EIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon is carefully considering the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. Through monitoring and mitigation, Chiquita Canyon will be able to address needs and issues as they develop – something we feel is vital to protecting the long-term interests of the region and ensuring the ongoing support of area residents.

I applaud the ongoing efforts of Chiquita Canyon Landfill to manage and process the solid waste needs of the region in a responsible and safe manner. The members of the town council look forward to our continued partnership with Chiquita Canyon and to helping protect the solid waste needs of the Santa Clarita Valley and the LA region for years to come.

Sincerely,

Dave Bossert President, West Ranch Town Council

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1st District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2nd District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3rd District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4th District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5th District Barbara Myler PO Box 55133 Valencia, CA 91385

February 08, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision

Dear Mr. Dae:

I'm writing to you not only as a long-time resident of Santa Clarita, but as a cancer survivor. I fought against cancer and won. Thankfully I'm still here today to fight for Chiquita Canyon. I've heard a lot of hurtful allegations and misleading information from opponents of Chiquita Canyon related to cancer claims.

They are taking advantage of a life-threatening disease and using it for their own personal vendettas against the landfill. 1 am personally heartbroken that people would use a disease I fought to survive as a means to scare others.

I've been to Chiquita Canyon Landfill and I know the operators. I've worked with them, as a generous community partner for close to 30 years, helping to keep our community clean.

As a cancer survivor, I support Chiquita Canyon. As a cancer survivor, I can tell people that there is nothing to be scared about the trash from our homes going to a landfill to be buried. As a cancer survivor, I can tell you landfill opponents have stooped to a new low and have shown a total lack of integrity. As a cancer survivor, I implore you to demonstrate to the public that Chiquita Canyon is below the safety thresholds set by the AQMD for the public's health. As a cancer survivor, I ask you to approve the landfill's expansion.

In looking at the Partial Recirculated Draft EIR, it is clear that Chiquita Canyon is carefully considering the potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operation, as well as the resulting byproducts of the construction and expansion process. Through monitoring and mitigation, Chiquita Canyon will be able to address needs and issues as they develop – something we feel is vital to protecting the long-term interests of the region and ensuring the ongoing support of area residents.

Chlquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Support 2-9-17 Page 2 of 2

Our trash has to go somewhere and Chiquita Canyon is a Gold Star landfill with an impressive reputation. That is why I support and am asking for your support for the Master Plan Revision and expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Barbara Myler

President/CEO

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District



Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

As the owner of the local radio station in Santa Clarita, KHTS AM-1220 for the past twenty-seven years and the most read news website, <u>www.hometownstation.com</u>, my wife and I would like to express our support for the expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Ge

Carl Goldman

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District

24320 Main Street - Santa Clarita, CA 91321 - (661) 298-1220



Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.



Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely, Karen Bryden

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

23504 LYONS AVENUE, SUITE 201 NEWHALL, CALIFORNIA 91321

TELEPHONE FACSIMILE E-MAIL (661) 310-1444 (661) 270-2644 NicoleYoungEsq@yahoo.com

February 13, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion, they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

Page Two February 13, 2017

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Very truly yours, LAW OFFICE OF NICOLE YOUNG

6 NICOLE A. YOUNG

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup>District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

NY/th

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

incereb év Starczyk cc:

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Kevin MacDonald Executive Director Santa Clarita Valley Senior Center

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

l am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Linda Hafizi

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL - SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiguita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Anya Smilanick

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1st District cc: Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District District

Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5th

Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3rd District

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta
### February 13, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely.

Marlon Roa

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District February 13, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident, elected official and a very active member of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, In reviewing the documents and conversations with Chiquita Canyon officials I am in agreement that we need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. I believe Chiquita meets those needs.

In my research I have come to find out that Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

As a leader in the community and advocate for our youth, I see a great opportunity to teach them on the many ways to handle our waste and also see opportunities to expose them to new carrier opportunities in the ever evolving industry geared at protecting our environment.

Chiquita has always been a good neighbor, community member and supporter in our community for decades. Many residence don't notice their operations because of the good job they are doing. They do a great job at being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. Chiquita provides environmental education and support for our seniors. I am very impressed with the level of attention Chiquita gives to their operations and keeping the community informed and safe.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely Joe Messina

CC:

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signatur

Ciaur

Print Name

February 13, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Dennis Verner

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District February 13, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and solid community partner, and in my opinion should be allowed to expand to meet the growing needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. Waste disposal needs to be handled in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Ed Masterson

Ed Masterson

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District



9716.201

February 13, 2017

Mr. Samuel Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: Chiquita Canyon Landfill – Support for Full Expansion

Dear Mr. Dae,

As a longstanding business owner and resident of Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability, converting landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With this expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

We are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon. Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Kpsmu see

Larry Rasmussen LR/dim

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District

Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

21070 Centre Pointe Parkway, Santa Clarita, California 91350 661.259.5606 Fax: 661.259.4065

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

AURICIO GARCIA

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Maric

Firma

11 Lena

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

SANCLES

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA -- SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Bizabilh Rivas

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aqui.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Pacheco

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

fure Sié

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Meno, Marchel

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre 'de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Savillon

Nombre de imprenta

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiguita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Carolynedire

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

y Bolena

Firma

Santiago Bolanos Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

min Bautista

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

FIRE KAMOS

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Enerodo Meytez gnature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Eith JI Barry Signature

Enika M. Barrajas.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Cubrean

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature Harjot Sekhon

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Print Name
Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

nature Print Name

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

SE. M. A GUILLAS

**Print Name** 

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Ernaudez

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

MAMA DAA

Signature

Alina Carmen

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiguita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

Ram 152000

Print Name

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

RNANDEZ

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiguita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiguita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

fure

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Print Name

### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Cana China

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

el Salazar Ndel Salazar

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural Impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

VILTOr

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

som hummerville, Cloud

Signature

Towi Summer-ville Clard t Name

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Man'o Bundos Signature Manio Pacundo

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiguita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

NTONIO LUPIAJ

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name
Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

M/MO OCho-

Print Name

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

MAI M. FIFCO

**Print Name** 

### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES **APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Saluzion

Nombre de imprenta

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature **Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signatu

Print Nar

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

full expansion of Chiquita Canvon Landfill! i support the

Signature

**Print Name** 

### **APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiguita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Haria X. Medina Tirma

Maria Kechut Medina

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

loria \_arm

nature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Piendo Elz Contra

Signature

Brende Genzalez Centra

Mr. Sam Dae

County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Wabour. KOLDON

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

 $r_{il}, \mathcal{O}$  ac

**Print Name** 

# **APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

menterl

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiguita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

-Mendoza

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Garlia

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

SEP MICHTS

Signature

P Macias

Print Name

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES **APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Altredo Zepeda Alfredo Zepeda

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

amai

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill! Signature

### **APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

|           | in the    | ~       |   |
|-----------|-----------|---------|---|
| Signature | $\supset$ | 1       |   |
|           | Kerry     | w. they | 5 |

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signatu

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name**
Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita-Ganyon Landfill!

Signature

na

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Guel Subrez

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

<u>Oppando Ristar</u> Firma

Nombre de imprenta

100

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiguita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

<u>Hugo Rodriguez</u> Signature <u>Hugo Rogry</u>

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Walter Andrude

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Landfill

| I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiqui | ta Canyon |
|--|-----------|
| Signature  | <u></u>   |
| Print Name   | 1         |

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

2 Barrietto

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Jamm Mendoza

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

1 Isiordia

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

NULANO

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

(UNISTEMEN MAURER

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

- Sitas Neguil

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

ALTATION RUTATION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

i am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Tomasco Sancia

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Richman

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

SILMAS

Signature

SILVEY

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

eis Fernudez TRUCKING

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ignature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature
# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

dree Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

alerec Signature

Valerie Guijarra

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signatu

Print Nam

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Print Name

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Jesus Zouala

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon LandfillI

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

Girtierrez

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signa

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Slenature

Print Name

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

SALTE

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Aliza

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

iler Garlia

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Miguel

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

**Print Name** 

### ΥΟ ΑΡΟΥΟ **CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION**

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar el proyecto completo de expansión para Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

PULSO ENRIDUEZ Firma

Nombre de imprenta

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

JAN CAMERON

Print Name

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Jose Prvn Japin Signature

PAGE 02/04

٩

### I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

54

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

WARP.

**Print Name** 

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES **APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

Signature

NULAND

**Print Name** 

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ml Signature

Print Name

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES **APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE** CHIOUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma SULIU C. CARRILIO

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

CAMERON

Print Name

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Alcantara

Nombre de imprenta

# **APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Ampelia Barajas

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

22d
#### YO APOYO **CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar el proyecto completo de expansión para Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Liopoldo EonzALES

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

gnature

QUINONES Print Name

### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

SONCHEZ 20210

Nombre de imprenta

#### **I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

<u>man</u>

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

she comp

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Miguel ANGRA

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

CABANK

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

CAus

esus

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

**Print Name** 

### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill! Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

ne Mesta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signaturé SIDR

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aslde area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Scott A Complet

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

in Satres

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

5 Salera-UISI

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

tin Salazon

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

LIS FERNALDEZ TRUCKING

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

<u>Aaura Suzman</u> iignature Laura Guzman

Print Name

#### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Zam

Eduardo Grvantes

Print Name

#### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

September 1

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

i support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

1mg

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name
Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Coroous POLDAN

**Print Name** 

#### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

#### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ture

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiguita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiguita Canyon Landfill!

Uner Morales

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyor Landfill!

Signature

16 RIVIFAK

Print Name

### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ma

Chez 0210

Nombre de imprenta

### **APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

A SALBILYO

Nombre de imprenta

### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES **APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiguita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

AlcaNtara

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chlquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signat

**Print Name** 

#### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES **APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

<u>B. LEO bel</u> d.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

e Zie Sienature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Sarcia

Print Name

#### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnologia de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill! Firma

yentes Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

#### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

#### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Fìrma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Kuhandh hature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

1997 · Zm

Jeaus Zovala

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Almer

Print Name
Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

 $IK_i = f$ SUCKLE

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chlquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Sergio Mora Orliz

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here,

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signa

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES **APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleño sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

IN a der M.

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

mehring

Print Name

# **APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Castillo

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Candlorio Rolling Signature Candlario Rolling

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiguita Canvon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature SEC/ LVAP

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

PIER

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

ígnature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiguita Canyon Landfill!

Lui ( Ransinco Signature

Luy, lam, L

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

inatur MARKE TILEDA-FILAS

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill)

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

cuo

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signat

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

19 der (Jarcia

Print Name

## **APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiguita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Lourdon E R

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

F.I. ZARATE

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

E1

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Balderas

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature July Solis

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nomero

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

lina

Signature

L. Mr.

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name
### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

gnature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

sgrillin-

## LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

## I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

1 am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

Print Name

## LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

alvader M-

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signatú Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

l am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support/the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

01-1-1

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

POTO (TUTIEREZ

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Camos dedo Cruz

**Print Name** 

## LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

on lon

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiguita Canyon Landfill!) Signatu

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

FL ZACATE

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

٦

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

20 CarronZa

Print Name

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Gistierrez

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signatúre

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Vailey and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

ignature

Print Name

## LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES **APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma SULIU C. CARRILIO

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ROGELIO MOTO ROGELIO MOTO Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

oniel soucoo

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Wripty Sandlin Signature J TRIPTY SANDHU

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Gay tan

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

## APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

## APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Maribel Bolanos

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiguita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

nuch Rodryvez Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Grout Randall

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Śignature Print Name
Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

EVRY

**Print Name** 

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

**Print Name** 

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signa ture **Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

đ

## I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Micanolt

**Print Name** 

5

### I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

nature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles **Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

mar vin

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiguita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Shlson

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

## APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signäture

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

79YCLG

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

HAVELOS Signature Horacio Autilos

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Aceves

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**Print Name** 

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

- Carlos Hernandez

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

VUDYO 50

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature Print Name

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma 🥏

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

SNIG

Print Name

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full-expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

## LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

ENRIQUE GUEREAM

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiguita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signatu

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiguita Canyon Landfill!

Jan I Pono

AS BARO TRKO

Signature

PL PARO

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiguita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

<u>CARLARC</u> Signature

# LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta
Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

CABANK 10UIC

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signatur

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Sigr

Print Na

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

BLODGY

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ignature

NGR. Print Name

## LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES **APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiguita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

ENRIQUE GURRAM

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Tric Avida

Print Name

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

arroya Ze

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill! Signature

**Print Name** 

٠.

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

ature Dric Arida

Print Name

## I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signaty

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

| I support/the | full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill! |
|---------------|---|
| Å             |   |
| Signature     | Ú   |
|               | Custine R                                   |
| During Manage |   |

Print Name

1

### YO APOYO CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar el proyecto completo de expansión para Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Acmad D Firma

trinvola Grazal

## I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Sig

Print Name

February 06, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Dae:

As a local resident, I recognize that Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County. I know the company and its representatives have practiced due diligence regarding key current and future issues, and have measures in place to address key concerns throughout construction and daily operation.

As a local resident, I know our trash has to go somewhere. There are two points that I would like to touch on, in order to request your support for the expansion.

The first being the community activist role that Chiquita has been playing in the Greater Santa Clarita Valley. They strive to work with the poor and underserved communities as well as help underprivileged children, including more than \$360,000 per year given to Val Verde for scholarships, tutors, and youth programs.

Secondly, the Clean Energy Facility, environmental protection systems, and responsible handling of incoming solid waste reflects their commitment to being a good neighbor. Currently, they are powering over 10,000 homes with clean energy and we can only see the number increasing with this expansion. After reviewing the Partial Recirculated DEIR, it is clear that Chiquita is running a clean and safe operation.

They have carefully considered any potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of daily operations, as well as the resulting of byproducts of the construction and expansion process.

I look forward to our Valley's continued partnership with Chiquita Canyon and to helping protect the solid waste needs of the Santa Clarita Valley and the LA region for years to come. As a result, I am pleased to support the findings of the Partial Recirculated Draft EIR and the Expansion Plan.

Sincerely,

David Z. Menchaca

David Menchaca President, SCV Boys & Girls Club

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL** Dear Mr. Dae:

I wanted to take a moment and acknowledge the ongoing support that the Chiquita Canyon Landfill has shown to the Youth Project since 2009. We are a small non-profit organization that provides free mental health support to teens 12-18, on all of the junior high and high school campuses in the Santa Clarita Valley. Our small but mighty staff work with kids who are dealing with substance abuse, depression, suicide, grief, domestic abuse, neglect, bullying and so much more. We have been fortunate to meet the needs of more than 33,000 teens and families since opening our doors in 2000. And we are very proud of those efforts.

We would not be able to achieve such success as we have for the last 16 years, if it were not for the financial support of community minded companies, such as Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Because our services are free to families, we rely heavily on donations to cover our agency's costs – to this end, the team at Chiquita has been at the top of the list for support.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

14 So

Kim Goldman, Executive Director of the Santa Clarita Valley Youth Project.

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

John Musella

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL - SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION** 

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10.000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Sincerely, Jeff Preach

// cc:

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 14 District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 24 District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 34 District



Jack & Belinda Crawford Owners

The UPS Store 31858 Castaic Road Castaic, CA 91384 661.775.3999 Tel 661.775.9254 Fax store4175@theupsstore.com

February 13, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a business owner in Castaic, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely Jack/Crawfod

cć:

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL - SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Εİν. Signer Flo Lawrence

CC:

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4th District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5th District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a business manager in the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Curtis Woods

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL -- SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

**Brian Higgins** 

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

**Maureen Daniels** 

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiguita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Alejandro 17. Saenz

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Miguel ANGRELMON

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,



Kevin D. Korenthal

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sinceri

8d)

Supervisor Hilds L. Solis, 14 District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Themas, 14 District Supervisor Budis Rushi, 34 Bistrict

Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4º District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5º District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL -- SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Note Yo

Montse Garriga

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District
#### February 13, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely Moe F

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District cc: Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4th District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District

#### February 13, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely.

Ivan Volschenk

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District

#### February 13, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely Jeri Seratti-Goldman

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>a</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>nd</sup> District

Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

onn Ton

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Villacorta Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

ALL OI Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County,

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Monis clavel

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Center'

Print Name

### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Alex PASMIREZ

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. in addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

esus Aceves

Print Name

### I SUPPORT CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

i am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

0

Signature

VIKE HEARDS

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Ohlson

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

<u>Satta</u> R

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signatu

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

usviel lesi

Print Name

### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

omole.

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Juddelloup 102A Signature

### LOS TRANSPORTADORES DE RESIDUOS LOCALES APOYAN LA EXPANSIÓN DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE**

Soy un transportista local de desechos que necesita ver a Chiquita Canyon continuar sus operaciones y expandirse para satisfacer la creciente necesidad de eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles.

Como transportista local, tenemos menos y menos opciones en la eliminación de desechos en el condado de Los Ángeles. Necesitamos que Chiquita Canyon continúe sus operaciones para mantener el mercado competitivo. Tememos que sin opciones, otros vertederos pueden monopolizar el mercado y aumentar las tasas de eliminación.

El relleno sanitario de Chiquita Canyon es un dispositivo de eliminación de modelos y debe ampliarse completamente para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de desechos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

¡Apoyo la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firma

CHREPERER MAURER

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Jar Jin

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

Signature

PATRONAS 29T F

Print Name

### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

ABREI

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

jenature Stel LVIP

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

27150

Signature

### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Fleand I

Firma

Epopuiel L. Flores

Nombre de imprenta
Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

SILAAJ

Signature

SILVEY

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

zenaida Bocian

Nombre de imprenta

## **I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF** CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

-W. 100

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

# **APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO**

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Sontiago Rolanos

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill

Signature

FU

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

RANGEL

### APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA - SOPORTE** 

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro decadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Firmay

Nombre de imprenta

### I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF **CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

CHELSEY RICHMON

Print Name

### I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

nature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

alinshouts,

Alen Warda

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

R. D. I.C.M

Paul De La Cerda

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District



9716.202

February 13, 2017

Mr. Samuel Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### RE: Chiquita Canyon Landfill – Support for Full Expansion

Dear Mr. Dae,

As a longstanding resident and business owner in Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Most importantly, we are proud to have such an amazing community-minded company poised and ready to meet these needs. Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of our SCV community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely Samueller

Peğgy J. Rasmuşsen PJR/DM

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District

Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

21070 Centre Pointe Parkway, Santa Clarita, California 91350 661.259.5606 Fax: 661.259.4065

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL - SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Pt Ull.

Peter Warda

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Willia C- Caspa

**Bill Cooper** 

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Brigittewala

**Brigette Warda** 

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Scott Nevius

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION** 

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

that hath

Nathan Keith

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

February 06, 2017

Mr. Sam Dae



### SANTA CLARITA VALLEY Chamber of Commerce

**County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Dae:

I'm writing on behalf of the Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce in support of the Chiquita Canyon Expansion Plan. The responsible management of solid waste is key to our growing region, and the expansion being proposed for Chiquita Canyon will address this issue. Chiquita Canyon Landfill is regulated by over 2 dozen government agencies, and after reviewing the findings from the Partial Recirculated Draft EIR, we can conclude that Chiquita runs a clean and safe operation.

Chiquita Canyon is a local business that contributes to the economy and was recognized as the Business of the Year by the Chamber in 2014. Local businesses have located and relocated to the Valencia Commerce Center adjacent to the landfill, knowing that Chiquita Canyon is a neighboring business. We recognize the important role that Chiquita Canyon plays in the Santa Clarita Valley and the region as a whole.

The items highlighted in the Recirculated Draft EIR document address some of the key concerns associated with the expansion and operation of Chiquita Canyon, including the biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, air quality, and project alternatives. While many areas will not be impacted by the revisions, Chiquita Canyon will be monitoring every area and is prepared to mitigate any issues as needed. The Chamber feels this is line with how the company has done business over the last 40 years, operating the landfill in a responsible manner and taking measures to ensure the protection of the surrounding environment.

The Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce supports the expansion of the landfill, which will continue the region's ongoing partnership with the company and protect our solid waste disposal needs now and in the future. We support the expansion of the landfill and revisions to the Master Plan – all of which will continue the region's ongoing partnership with the company and protect our solid waste needs now and in the future.

Sincerely.

in M Baucio

Lois Bauccio President & CEO, SCV Chamber of Commerce

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1st District cc: Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3rd District Supervisor Janice Hahn, 4th District Supervisor Kathryn Barger, 5<sup>th</sup> District

> Santa Clarita City Hall 23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 265 • Santa Clarita, CA 91355 P (661) 702-6977 • F (661) 702-6980

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: VAL VERDE SUPPORTS CHIQUITA CANYON**

Dear Mr. Dae:

I am the past president of the Val Verde Community Advisory Committee (VVCAC) which is the official liaison group between the residents of Val Verde and the landfill.

During my time as a member of the VVCAC and while as president I was intimately involved with the operations of Chiquita Canyon. I can say, without a doubt, they run a great operation and should be commended.

A small group of opponents in Val Verde have used the expansion process to completely blow things out of proportion and blatantly lie about supposed health effects, odors and noise. Val Verde is a small, quiet, working-class community and this group of mostly Anglo opponents have bullied their way around town scaring people into thinking the worst about the landfill.

I have never seen something like this before. Most people in Val Verde and Castaic didn't even know the landfill existed. That's because Chiquita does a great job running their operations. We should be thanking them, not harassing them.

The landfill provides great benefits to the community of Val Verde in the way of millions of dollars over the last 20 years to pay for scholarship programs, tutoring, sports programs, senior bus passes and much more. This mostly Latino community has directly benefited from Chiquita Canyon and most residents appreciate all the landfill has done for them. My son received a scholarship that helped get him into college. He might not have been able to attend had it not been for Chiquita's support of Val Verde.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

Sincerely. m  $\neg o$ An Vanessa Brookman

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>e</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>nd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL - SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

ulteries

Sue Nevius

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>nd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL - SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Tony Warda

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL – SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

I am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely,

Paul Warda

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL -- SUPPORT FOR FULL EXPANSION**

Dear Mr. Dae:

Our waste has to go somewhere. For over four decades, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has proven itself to be a model disposal facility and should be expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

As a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley, I am in full support for Chiquita Canyon's expansion plans. The need for, and the benefits of expanding the landfill, are carefully considered and supported by the conclusion in the environmental review documents. We need to be able to handle the waste generated by us in the best way possible and with the lowest impact to the environment. Chiquita meets those needs.

Chiquita Canyon has been a leader in environmental sustainability. They convert landfill gas to clean energy which powers more than 10,000 homes each year. With the expansion they will not only create even more clean energy, but they have set aside space for a potential future conversion technology facility which will help redefine the way we dispose of waste in the future.

A regional waste disposal facility like Chiquita Canyon must go somewhere and we are proud to have such an amazing, good neighbor as Chiquita Canyon.

Chiquita has been a significant member and supporter of this community for decades. While no one notices their operations because of the good job they do in being invisible to our community, their positive impact on our community doesn't go without notice. From environmental education programs for our youth to supporting seniors and health families, the Santa Clarita Valley is grateful for all Chiquita does.

Other landfills and regional facilities should follow the lead set by Chiquita Canyon. The County should use Chiquita as a model of how regional operations should be run for the betterment of local communities and the entire County.

i am pleased to support the full expansion project for Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

Sincerely, 26

Harry Knafla

cc: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

VAREZ BETANCOURT

Print Name

# I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

lak odrigues

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles** Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

### I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Christian Mejia

**Print Name** 

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

#### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

10

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name
Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION -- SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

BCOM

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill! SCara

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

XIDN 6 7/C

**Print Name** 

# **I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL**

Mr. Sam Dae **County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning** 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Sanchere\_\_\_\_

Signature

# I SUPPORT THE FULL EXPANSION OF CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION - SUPPORT

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal demands.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

In addition, the expansion includes a set aside area for a future conversion technology facility.

For this and many other reasons, I feel that Chiquita Canyon has demonstrated a true commitment to the community and the people that live and work here.

I am pleased to support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

3040

Print Name

# APOYO LA EXPANSIÓN COMPLETA DE CHIQUITA CANYON TERRENO

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

### **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION COMPLETA – SOPORTE**

Chiquita Canyon Landfill es una instalación de eliminación de modelos y debe ser ampliada para satisfacer las necesidades de eliminación de residuos sólidos del condado de Los Angeles.

Si bien los cambios propuestos incluyen un aumento de la tasa de eliminación y el volumen, la extensión de huella, y el aumento de la elevación, el vertedero ampliado no afectará negativamente la integridad visual de la zona. Además, Chiquita ha practicado la debida diligencia para abordar los posibles impactos ambientales, de ruido, de tráfico y culturales de la expansión y operación en curso.

Chiquita Canyon ha estado sirviendo a la región continuamente por más de cuatro décadas, y juega un papel importante en el manejo de residuos sólidos del Valle de Santa Clarita y el Condado de Los Ángeles.

Además, la expansión incluye un área reservada para una instalación futura de tecnología de conversión.

Por esta y muchas otras razones, siento que Chiquita Canyon ha demostrado un verdadero compromiso con la comunidad y las personas que viven y trabajan aquí.

Me complace apoyar la plena expansión de Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Nombre de imprenta

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

## **RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT**

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

Mr. Sam Dae County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL FULL EXPANSION – SUPPORT** 

I am a local waste hauler who needs to see Chiquita Canyon continue its operations and expand to meet the growing need for waste disposal in LA County.

As a local hauler, we have fewer and fewer options on disposing waste in LA County. We need Chiquita Canyon to continue its operations to keep the marketplace competitive. We fear without options, other landfills may monopolize the market and increase disposal rates.

Chiquita Canyon Landfill is a model disposal facility and should be fully expanded to meet the needs of Los Angeles County's solid waste disposal needs.

While the proposed changes include an increased disposal rate and volume, footprint extension, and increased elevation, the expanded landfill will not negatively impact the visual integrity of the area. In addition, Chiquita has practiced due diligence in addressing potential environmental, noise, traffic, and cultural impacts of the expansion and ongoing operation.

Chiquita Canyon has been serving the region continuously for more than four decades, and plays an important role in the solid waste management of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County.

I support the full expansion of Chiquita Canyon Landfill!

Signature

Print Name

# Summary of Comments

• Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission have claimed that an agreement between the community and the landfill, as part of a prior landfill expansion project in 1997, promised that no further expansions would occur. The County prepared a Topical Response to these comments, which is included in the Final EIR.<sup>1</sup>

# Applicant Rebuttal

- The 1997 agreement does not prohibit or restrict future expansions.
- The community agreement was approved in February 1997, when a conditional use permit approved by the Regional Planning Commission for a prior expansion request was on appeal at the Board of Supervisors.
- It is clear from the history and context that the community agreement only set a limit on the 1997 use permit; it did not in any way limit future use permits or future expansions. The Regional Planning Commission approved the conditional use permit in September 1996, which included the following conditions:
  - 5. This grant, as it applies to the approved landfill expansion described in Condition 9, will terminate upon the completion of the approved fill design, as shown on Exhibit A, or on November 24, 2012, whichever occurs first.

Should this grant as it applies to the landfill expansion terminate **without new or additional permits having been granted**, no further waste shall be accepted for disposal.... (emphasis added)

- 9b. No portion of the expanded landfill may extend above the plane or outside of the surface area of the fill design as shown on the approved site plan, attached as Exhibit A....
- 9c. Nothing in Condition 9b or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the landfill or to otherwise modify the conditions of this grant. (emphasis added)
- The community agreement proposed that the County Board of Supervisors revise, delete, and add new conditions of approval to the permit approved by the Regional Planning Commission. The Board accepted the recommendations in the agreement and approved the permit with the modified conditions.
- The modified conditions extended the sunset date to November 24, 2019, restricted the weekly tonnage to 30,000 tons per week, and established an overall maximum tonnage cap at 23 million tons.
- Condition No. 9c was **not** changed.
- The language in Condition No. 5 allowing for new or additional permits to increase capacity was **not** changed.
- Accordingly, the 1997 community agreement related to the conditions of the prior expansion, and the scope of what could be done under the 1997 use permit. It did not prohibit or restrict future permitting decisions or future expansions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL APPLICANT REBUTTAL 1997 COMMUNITY AGREEMENT

 In addition, however the community agreement is characterized, it is a fundamental principle of California law that one Board of Supervisors may not "contract away" the police powers of later Boards of Supervisors. (*Avco Community Developers, Inc. v. South Coast Regional Com.* [1976] 17 Cal.3d 785, 800; *Summit Media, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* [2012] 211 Cal.App.4th 921, 935-36). Thus, even if the agreement were interpreted as commenters say it should be (and if the County was party), the agreement cannot be interpreted to prevent the Board of Supervisors from considering and approving a new landfill expansion request.

# Attachments

- Final EIR Topical Response No. 5
- Regional Planning Commission approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 89-081
- 1997 Community Agreement
- Board of Supervisor approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 89-081

# **CCL** Topical Responses

# 5. Conditional Use Permit and Community Agreement

# Summary of Comments

A number of commenters stated that Val Verde and the Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) signed a legal agreement in 1997 stating that the landfill would close when the total capacity of the landfill reached 23 million tons or on November 24, 2019, whichever came first. Commenters stated their belief that it was "guaranteed" that the landfill would close by 2019. It was suggested that the "agreement" or "contract" will be breached if the expansion is approved and that an extension of the landfill should be put on hold until the community and landfill come to agreement regarding the "agreement."

## Response

The "agreement" or "written agreement" or "1997 agreement" referred to by several commenters is most comprehensively attached to Original Draft Environmental Impact Report Comment Letter #9 ("Statement of Agreements and Understanding By and Between Newhall Land and Farming Co., Laidlaw Waste Systems [Chiquita], Inc., Val Verde Civic Association" [Agreement]). The Agreement identifies various agreements between the parties referenced above, including Val Verde Community Benefits Funds permitted expenditures and payment schedule, and Proposed Modifications to Conditional Use Permit 89 081-(CUP) Conditions of Approval and Monitoring Program (Attachment C to the Agreement).

The Agreement is between the community and the landfill operator/owner; Los Angeles County is not a party. However, a major focus of the agreement was to insert certain agreed-to conditions into Los Angeles County's CUP. The County did include certain new conditions as part of the final CUP approval by the Board of Supervisors, as described below.

Attachment C to the Agreement includes specific conditions that were proposed to be added to the existing CUP (No. 89-081[5]), and those conditions were added consistent with the terms of the Agreement. The specific conditions related to landfill closure are listed below:

- #9g Nothing in this condition shall permit the maximum landfill capacity of 23 million tons to be increased.
- #46<sup>1</sup> The maximum total capacity of the landfill shall be 23 million tons. Landfill closure shall occur when this capacity is reached, or by November 24, 2019, whichever occurs first.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> CCL reached the 23-million-ton overall disposal limit described in CUP Condition No. 46 in July 2016. Prior to that date, CCL requested and received a limited operational waiver issued by LADRP, pursuant to Los Angeles County Code Section 22.04.110, which became effective in July 2016. The waiver was supported by an Approved Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared pursuant to *California Environmental Quality Act* Guidelines Section 15164 which discloses that, although the landfill was approaching its 23-million-ton capacity, operational efficiencies left space within the vertical and horizontal envelope analyzed and approved as part of the Board of Supervisors Preferred Alternative. The limited waiver allows CCL to continue operation under the current CUP as long as the CCL and Los Angeles County are actively engaged in pursuit of a new CUP. The limited waiver allows CCL to accept waste up to the 29.4 million tons analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Report for CUP No. 89-081-(5) and requires CCL to provide weekly reports to LADRP on document waste disposal rates and

The County has no obligations under the Agreement.

The existing CUP for CCL also includes the following condition:

#9c Nothing in Condition 9b or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the landfill or to otherwise modify the conditions of this grant.

Condition #9c of the existing CUP makes clear that there is no prohibition against a future request for expansion. Also, when the Board of Supervisors approved the prior expansion in 1997, the Board specifically found that "additional capacity may be approved in the future..." The current request for an expansion (filed in October 2004 and subsequently amended) and therefore, a new CUP application, is entirely separate from the existing CUP. The County's decision on whether to grant the application will be based on balancing, as applicable, the economic, social, technical, or other benefits of the proposed project against its potential environmental risks.

remaining capacity. The waiver is scheduled to expire on July 31, 2017. However, the waiver will cease to be in effect before that date if a final approval or denial action is taken on the CUP application by the County, if the CUP is withdrawn by the applicant, or if the waiver is revoked by the Director of Planning.



Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

Director of Planning James E. Hartl. AICP



September 11, 1996

### CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Rodney Walter Laidlaw Waste Systems 29201 Henry Mayo Drive Valencia CA 91355

Dear Mr. Walter:

## SUBJECT: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 89081-(5) CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION AND RELATED FACILITIES

The Regional Planning Commission, by its action of September 11, ( 1996, granted the above-described permit. Documents pertaining to this permit are enclosed.

During the fifteen-day period following your receipt of this letter, the Commission's decision may be appealed by any interested party to the Board of Supervisors through the office of Joanne Sturges, Executive Officer, Room 383, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. This grant will not become effective until and unless this period has passed without an appeal.

Please call Mr. Richard Frazier at (213) 974-6446 if there are questions.

Very truly yours,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING James E. Hartl, AICP Director of Planning

John R. Schwarze, AICP, Administrator Current Planning Branch

JRS:RF

Attachments: Findings and Conditions, Affidavit

cc: Public Works, Health Services, Board of Supervisors, Zoning Enforcement, Dale Neal, Testifiers

(a) ٠

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 89081-(5)

COMMISSION HEARING DATES: AUGUST 9, AUGUST 15, AUGUST 23, SEPTEMBER 26 AND NOVEMBER 30, 1995; JANUARY 8, 1996

### SYNOPSIS

Laidlaw Waste Systems, operator of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, applied for a Conditional Use Permit to continue and expand the landfill and to construct and operate a materials recovery facility. The proposed landfill expansion would have a capacity of approximately 30 million tons of waste and would receive up to 10,000 tons of waste per day for disposal.

A draft environmental impact report for the project was prepared and circulated for public and agency review. Two public hearing dates before the Regional Planning Commission were duly noticed. These hearings were scheduled for August 9, 1995, at the Commission's hearing room, and August 23, 1995, at Valencia High School.

Subsequent to noticing of the public hearings, the Board of Supervisors directed that the Commission's hearing record on the draft environmental impact report should remain open until at least November 16, 1995.

#### PROCEDURE BEFORE THE COMMISSION

<u>Hearing of August 9, 1995</u>. Staff from the Departments of Regional Planning and Public Works made presentations to the Commission.

Three persons, representing the applicant, briefly explained the request and responded to questions from the Commission. At the request of the applicant's representatives, the applicant's formal presentation was deferred until after members of the public wishing to testify in favor of the project had an opportunity to speak.

Fourteen persons, being local residents and business persons and one landfill employee, spoke in favor of the project. At the conclusion of this testimony, the Commission continued the hearing to August 15, 1995, for the applicant's formal presentation.

<u>Hearing of August 15, 1995</u>. Six persons, representing the applicant, explained the proposed project and responded to questions from the Commission.

<u>Field Trip of August 21, 1995</u>. The Commission viewed the landfill and the adjacent Valencia Commerce Center and community of Val Verde. All members were present.

<u>Hearing of August 23, 1995</u>. The Commission conducted an evening hearing at Valencia High School.

One person, representing the City of Santa Clarita, presented comments from the city.

Thirty-seven persons testified in opposition. These included residents of the communities of Castaic and Val Verde and representatives of environmental groups. Spanish language translation was provided.

Due to time limitations, the Commission continued the hearing to September 26, 1995, in the Commission hearing room, to receive additional opposition testimony.

<u>Hearing of September 26, 1995</u>. The hearings reconvened at the Commission hearing room.

Fourteen persons spoke in opposition to the project. At the conclusion of this testimony, the Commission considered a request from the Val Verde Civic Association that the Commission hold a hearing at Val Verde Park. The Commission decided, instead, to continue the hearings to November 30, 1995, in the Commission hearing room, to afford opponents an additional opportunity to testify.

<u>Hearing of November 30, 1995</u>. One person, representing the City of Santa Clarita, presented written comment from the City on the draft environmental impact report.

Nineteen persons testified in opposition to the project. One person spoke in favor.

Having afforded all persons present an opportunity to testify, the Commission continued the public hearing to January 8, 1996, to receive the applicant's rebuttal, and indicated that written comment would be received through 5:00 p.m., November 30.

<u>Hearing of January 8, 1995</u>. Six persons, representing the applicant, spoke in rebuttal. At the conclusion of this presentation, the Commission closed the public hearing and, by a vote of 5-0, instructed staff to prepare a final environmental impact report and findings and conditions for approval of the project, based upon 18.2 million tons of waste capacity and a maximum disposal rate of 5,000 tons per day.

PAGE 2

### FINDINGS

1. The Chiquita Canyon landfill is an existing Class III waste disposal facility located on the north side of State Route 126 westerly of Interstate 5, in the vicinity of the community of Val Verde. The landfill is operated by Laidlaw Waste Systems on land leased from Newhall Land and Farming.

The landfill commenced operation in 1972. Laidlaw acquired its interest in the facility in 1986.

- 2. The Chiquita Canyon facility has operated under a series of zoning entitlements. The most recent of these is Conditional Use Permit 1809-(5), approved November 24, 1982. This permit expires on November 24, 1997.
- 3. Conditional Use Permit 1809-(5) allows waste to be accepted at Chiquita Canyon 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. But use during night time hours is limited to commercial and public waste haulers and a maximum of 15 trucks. There is no maximum daily waste intake specified in the use permit. However, the Solid Waste Facility Permit (issued by the County Department of Health Services) limits waste to 5,000 tons per day. The waste received at the landfill includes sewage sludge. The sludge is currently disposed in the fill.

The landfill has in the past received waste at its 5,000 tons per day limit, but recently has operated at a much lower rate. Laidlaw reports that in 1994, the facility received an average of approximately 1,720 tons per day.

- 4. Conditional Use Permit 1809-(5) authorized the fill to rise to an elevation of 1,220 feet above sea level. The operator estimates that at the current, reduced intake rate, about 25 months of disposal capacity (1,090,000 tons) would remain in the approved landfill design at the time of permit expiration on November 24, 1997.
- 5. The applicant proposes to continue operation of the landfill beyond 1997 by expanding the fill capacity by approximately 29.4 million tons of waste. The maximum elevation of fill would increase to 1,430 feet above sea level (210 feet above the current limit).

The filling would occur over lined portions of the existing landfill and in adjacent areas to the east and west which have not previously been part of the fill. The applicant further proposes that the quantity of waste received to be disposed at the fill be increased to a maximum of 10,000 tons per day. Access would continue to be from the existing entrance on State Route 126, although modifications to the entrance would be made to accommodate the increased waste flow.

At 10,000 tons per day, the landfill expansion would have a service life of about 8 years, beginning in 1997. By comparison, at 5,000 tons per day, the expansion would have capacity for 16 years of waste disposal, and at the current level of waste intake, 50 years of capacity.

- 6. The applicant also requests authorization to conduct composting operations at the landfill. The compost would consist of a mix of sewer sludge and shredded green waste. The applicant estimates that a maximum of 400 tons per day of green waste and 160 tons per day of sludge may be composted. The composting may be by an open, "windrow system" or an "invessel system". Use of sludge on-site as a soil amendment and of green waste for daily cover is also proposed.
- 7. The applicant further proposes to establish a materials recovery and recyclable household hazardous waste facility on a site adjacent to the east side of the landfill. The facility would handle up to 500 tons per day of source separated material and small quantities of household hazardous waste that can be recycled. No commercial hazardous waste would be accepted. The facility would be accessed via Wolcott Way, an entrance road to the Valencia Commerce Center.
- 8. The bulk of the subject property is zoned A-2-2 and A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture-Two and Five Acre Minimum parcel sizes). The balance of the property, primarily the easterly portion to be occupied by the recycling facility, is zoned M-1.5 DP (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing-Development Program). The requested uses may be sited within these zones with a Conditional Use Permit. No other zoning entitlements are required.
- 9. Approval of a conditional use permit is dependent (among other things) upon a finding of conformance with the general plan. Other required findings relate to: compatibility of the proposed use with adjacent property; adequacy of the site for the intended use; and availability of adequate access and utilities. The applicant's written burden of proof relative to these factors, dated July 27, 1995, was received and reviewed by the Commission. The factors are further addressed in the project environmental impact report, referenced below.
- 10. The Solid Waste Management Plan, contained in the Public Facilities Element of the County General Plan, depicts the Chiquita Canyon Landfill as an existing facility with capacity which will be filled by the year 2000. Such depiction is not, however, a determinant of plan consistency.

The plan provides that in considering a waste disposal facility the Regional Planning Commission shall be guided by the "expertise" of agencies such as the County Departments of the Public Works and Health Services and the State Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Air Quality Management District. "The criteria to be applied by the Commission in considering an application include the regional and local need for the specific waste disposal facility as well as the potential impacts the use will have on the community. These impacts include but are not limited to noise, odor, visual, circulation/traffic, air and water quality, seismic safety and safety. Regional need should not outweigh the impact on the community. Potential hazards should be given greater consideration than the regional need".

11. The bulk of the subject property is classified "Hillside Management" on the Santa Clarita Area Plan. Hillside Management is a rural designation applicable generally to steeply sloping terrain. A small portion of the property at its northeast corner is classified "Open Space" and another portion in the southeast area of the property is designated "Industry".

The "Open Space" classified area was formerly owned by the Federal Government and was assigned the open space designation for that reason. The property has since been exchanged in a land transfer and is in private ownership. Because the property is now privately held, it should be treated as nonurban (rural) under the criteria of the Santa Clarita Area Plan.

12. The area plan provides that subject to restrictions "to minimize environmental disruption and the loss of scenic and open space uses..." waste disposal facilities that require canyon locations as a buffer to urban uses may be sited within non-urban hillside management areas.

The applicable restrictions are as follows:

- The proposed use should be located and designed so as not to conflict with established or planned community land use and circulation patterns. Whenever necessary, the proposed land use should be located and designed so as to provide an appropriate land buffer between potentially disruptive, polluting and/or hazardous uses and surrounding lands.
- The proposed use shall be located in areas deemed suitable from an ecologic, geologic, and topographic standpoint. The design must minimize the environmental and geologic impacts of the project and preclude groundwater contamination.

PAGE 5

- Access, egress, and onsite parking should be provided in a manner that maximizes safety and minimizes adverse impacts on surrounding land use patterns. Convenient all weather access will be required for fire fighting purposes.
  - The design and location of the project should ensure that the transport of toxic, explosive, or otherwise hazardous substances will avoid existing or planned residential communities. Building and site design of any potentially volatile or otherwise hazardous land use should consider as its prime objective the health, safety, and welfare of the community in which it is situate or to which it is proximate.
    - The proposed site should be appropriately landscaped, fenced, and screened too minimize the visual impact on surrounding and overlooking residences. Particular consideration shall be given to noise, odor, lights, and traffic impacts on neighboring development.
    - In identified hazard areas, the design of proposed developments should include use of appropriate hazard mitigating or avoidance measures. Such hazards include fire and flooding.
- 13. The portion of the property classified "Industry" is, generally, the location of the proposed recycling facility. SR-126 (the main access route to the landfill) is classified as a scenic drive and is proposed for further study as a "First Priority" scenic route. SR-126 is classified as a major highway on the County Highway Plan. Santa Clarita Area Plan policies suggest that SR-126 may be reclassified in the future as an expressway.
- 14. Under the California Integrated Waste Management Act, the County is required to prepare and adopt a <u>Countywide</u> <u>Integrated Waste Management Plan</u>, including a siting element providing for at least 15 years of waste disposal capacity. The County Department of Public Works is currently preparing the plan, including assessments of the need for and availability of landfill space.

The Department of Public Works projects that even with full realization of waste reduction and recycling goals and maximum expansion/utilization of existing landfills, the County's landfill disposal capacity will eventually decline to the point it will be inadequate to meet the County's daily waste disposal need. The actual time of need for additional capacity will depend upon a number of variables, in particular the final closure dates of certain major landfill facilities in Los Angeles County.

- 15. The County's current landfill policies date to adoption of its <u>Solid Waste Management Action Plan</u> on April 5, 1988, by the Board of Supervisors. Action 7 of the plan provided in part: "Support the revision of all existing permits at the Azuza Western, Chiquita Canyon, North Valley (Sunshine Canyon), Puente Hills and Scholl Canyon Landfills to provide for the maximum, technically and environmentally feasible expansion of these sites...".
- 16. Val Verde, a community predominately of single family homes on small lots, lies to the northwest of the landfill site. To the east is a developing commercial and industrial park, currently containing a Post Office facility and one light industrial occupancy. The land to the immediate north, west and south of the landfill is undeveloped and/or devoted to agricultural use.
- 17. The undeveloped lands to the west, east and south of the landfill are owned by the Newhall Land and Farming Company, which is also the owner of the landfill property.
- 18. A Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was prepared and circulated for agency and public review. The Commission received extensive comment on the DEIR from both the public and government agencies, including the Departments of Public Works and Health Services, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Air Quality Management District and other State and County agencies having responsibility for permitting of waste disposal and processing facilities.
- 19. Following completion of the written comment period and public hearings on the DEIR, the Commission directed that a final environmental impact report (EIR) be prepared.

The EIR contains a detailed description of the project and documents the projects' potential impacts and the proposed measures which could be undertaken to mitigate such impacts. The findings of fact with respect to these impacts and mitigation measures, a monitoring and reporting program, and a statement of overriding considerations for those impacts of the project which cannot be reduced to insignificance, are appended hereto as Attachment "A" and are included in these findings by reference as if set forth in full herein.

20. The EIR includes analysis for Traffic/Access, Biota, Geotechnical Hazard, Cultural Resources, Flood Hazard/Hydrology, Water Quality, Air Quality, Odor and Other Nuisance, Visual Quality/Landform Alteration, Noise, Services, Fire Hazard and Public Health environmental factors.

PAGE 7

The EIR concludes that even with available mitigations, significant residual impacts would occur in the areas of air quality and landform alteration. Specifically:

- Operational emissions of ozone precursors (NOx and ROC) and PM10 (fine dust) would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds of significance and nuisance odors may potentially result from composting;
  - Construction emissions of NOx would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds of significance during construction periods;
  - There would be a permanent change in landform due to the landfill and recycling facility development.
- 21. In assessing the available alternatives as discussed in the project EIR and during the public hearing, the Commission finds that it should grant authorization for a maximum waste disposal rate of 5,000 tons per day at the landfill and an initial increment of the proposed expansion having a capacity of approximately 18.2 million tons. At the 5,000 ton per day rate of fill, this first increment would have a maximum life of 10 years. Additional capacity may be approved in the future, if the demand for in County fill capacity continues as now projected.
- 22. Based upon the project EIR, with reasonable care and due diligence in the regulation and operation of the landfill, hazard to the neighboring community and public services will not occur. Approval of the landfill expansion in increments will serve to assure that the landfill will be operated in compliance with the Conditions of grant and that any warranted changes in conditions can be made, if necessary, in connection with future applications for expansion.
- 23. The Commission finds that the proposed materials recovery facility should be authorized for a 30 year term of grant. The proposed site of this facility is within a developing business park and the nature of operation and its planned appearance is such that it will be fully compatible with other contemplated uses. The facility also has the potential to provide a necessary service in assisting to achieve waste diversion and recycling goals. A fixed term of grant is, however, appropriate to enable adjustments in the grant which may become necessary due to future changes in circumstances.
- 24. The Commission does not find it appropriate to require that the Materials Recovery Facility be constructed and operated as a condition of entitlement to expand the landfill. However,

the applicant's offer of such a facility was a significant factor in the Commission's decision to authorize the continued operation of the landfill. The Commission therefore expects the applicant-permittee to exercise good faith and due diligence in working to establish the facility.

- 25. The applicant's submitted plans, copies of which are on file, verify that there is adequate area at the landfill and materials recovery site for necessary ancillary facilities, including recycling areas and employee parking.
- 26. The traffic, access and utility services for the project are addressed in detail in the EIR and attached environmental findings.

The proposed materials recovery facility (MRF) site, which as noted in Finding 13, above, is classified "Industry" on the Santa Clarita General Plan, is also designated "urban expansion" on the Development Policy Map of the County General Plan. As such, development of the site with an urban use is subject to a finding of conformance with Development Monitoing System (DMS) criteria. Development of the MRF site and adjacent area were previously found in conformance with DMS criteria in connection with approval of the Valencia Commerce Center in Conditional Use Permit 87360-(5), the findings for which are incorporated herein by reference. An urban services analysis and environmental assessment specific to the proposed MRF were included in the project EIR for Conditional Use Permit 89081-(5). Findings with respect to the economic, social and environmental DMS factors for the MRF are contained in Attachment "A". The conditions of grant for the MRF will require that the MRF development comply with all infrastructure and design specifications of Conditional Use Permit 87360-(5).

27. A portion of the burden of proof for a conditional use permit is that "... the requested use at the location proposed will not... be materially detrimental to the ... valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site".

Opponents of the landfill have maintained that extension of the landfill as proposed would significantly diminish the value of property within adjacent residential areas. Studies on this subject have been commissioned by the applicant and presented to the Commission. The Commission determines that the preponderance of evidence does not support a finding that the modified project would be materially detrimental.

### BASED ON THE FOREGOING; THE COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

- A. The use as modified and conditioned is consistent with the adopted general plan.
- B. As modified and with the attached restrictions and conditions, the requested use will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area and will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site and will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the pubic health, safety or general welfare.
- C. The site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance and otherwise required to integrate the use requested with the uses in the surrounding area.
- D. The site has adequate traffic access and is adequately served by other public or private facilities which it requires.

### COMMISSION ACTION:

The Regional Planning Commission:

- A. Approves the final environmental impact report prepared for the project and certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information contained therein; and
- B. Certifies that the Final Environmental Impact Report has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the State Guidelines, and the County Guidelines; and
- C. Determines that the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in Attachment "A" are the only mitigation measures for this project which are feasible and that unavoidable significant effects of the project after adoption of the mitigation measures, are as described in Attachment "A".
- D. Determines that the remaining, unavoidable environmental effects of the project, as described in Attachment "A", have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the specific social, economic and environmental benefits of the project as stated in said Attachment "A".

In view of the findings of fact presented above, Conditional Use Permit 89081-(5) is GRANTED with the attached conditions and monitoring program.

## VOTE:

Concurring; Toy, Clark, Wulliger, Guido and Russell Dissenting; None

Abstaining; None

Absent; None

Date of Action; September 11, 1996

÷

## CONDITIONS OF PROJECT APPROVAL CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 89081-(5)

- 1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.
- 2. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee and the owner of the property involved (if other than the permittee) have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning their affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant.
- 3. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65907 or other applicable time period. The County shall promptly notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the permittee of any claim, or if the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the permittee shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the County.

In the event that any claim, action or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay the Department of Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which the actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expense involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including, but not limited to, depositions, testimony and other assistance to the permittee or the permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deposited.

- a. If during the litigation process the actual costs incurred decrease the account to less than \$1,000, an amount necessary to restore the balance to \$5,000. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required before completion of the litigation.
- b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The costs for collection and duplication of records shall be paid by the permittee according to the provisions of Section 2.170.010 of the County Code.

- 4. Attached to these conditions is a Monitoring Program which is incorporated into these conditions by reference. The permittee shall fully perform each action required of the permittee by the monitoring program as if it were specifically set forth in these conditions.
- 5. This grant, as it applies to the approved landfill expansion described in Condition 9, will terminate upon the completion of the approved fill design, as shown on Exhibit

"A," or on November 24, 2012, whichever occurs first.

Should this grant as it applies to the landfill expansion terminate without new or additional permits having been granted, no further waste shall be accepted for disposal. However, the permittee is authorized to continue such facilities in operation as are necessary to complete mitigation measures required by this grant, for closure or post-closure maintenance required by federal, state and local agencies, or for operation of the materials recovery facility described in Condition 10, the recyclable household hazardous waste facility described in Condition 11 and the composting facility described in Condition 12. All facilities not required for mitigation, closure or post-closure maintenance or such recycling facilities shall be removed unless they are of a type permitted as a matter of course by the zoning regulations then in effect.

This grant as it applies to the materials recovery facility described in Condition 10, the recyclable household hazardous waste facility described in Condition 11 and the composting facilities described in Condition 12 shall terminate on November 24, 2027. Use of the property thereafter shall be in accord with the regulations then in effect.

- 6. If any provision of this grant that is challenged by the permittee is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
- 7. The subject property shall be developed, maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property, including but not limited to those permits, if any, issued by the following agencies:
  - a. The Local Enforcement Agency and the California Integrated Waste Management Board;
  - b. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region;
  - c. The South Coast Air Quality Management District;
  - d. The California Department of Fish and Game;
  - e. The California Environmental Protection Agency;
  - f. The California Department of Transportation;
  - g. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

. .

Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

- 8. Notice is hereby given that any person intentionally violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or a hearing officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant if the Commission or hearing officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.
- 9. This grant allows the establishment and operation of a Class III landfill, together with certain ancillary and related activities as enumerated herein, subject to the following restrictions as to use:
  - a. Liquid or hazardous waste or radioactive waste/material shall not be accepted. Should such prohibited waste be nevertheless received at the landfill, it shall be handled and disposed of as provided in Condition 26. The term "liquid waste" as used herein does not include non-hazardous sludges meeting the requirements contained in Title 23, Chapter 15 of the California Code of Regulations for disposal in a Class III landfill.
  - b. No portion of the expanded landfill may extend above the plane or outside of the surface area of the fill design as shown on the approved site plan, attached as Exhibit A.

As used in this Condition 9b "landfill" refers to the portion of the subject property in which waste is to be permanently placed and then buried under daily and interim cover material but excludes adjacent cut slopes, temporary storage areas, and any materials recovery facility, composting facility, recyclable household hazardous waste facility, and ancillary facilities authorized by this grant. Allowance for settlement of fill shall not be made in determining compliance with this Condition 9b.

- c. Nothing in Condition 9b or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the landfill or to otherwise modify the conditions of this grant.
- d. The net tonnage placed in the landfill shall not exceed 35,000 tons per week (5,000 tons per day average based upon 7 working days per week).
- e. The net tonnage of waste placed in the landfill on any given day shall not exceed 6,000 tons.
- f. Net tonnage shall not include:
  - Clean dirt or other approved materials used for daily cover, to cover and prepare interim and final fill slopes, or for other construction purposes; and

- Waste processed and put to a beneficial use on the landfill or separated or otherwise diverted from the waste stream and exported from the landfill for the purpose of recycling or reuse, in accord with the restrictions of Condition 9j and the agreement entered into pursuant to Part II of the attached monitoring program, and including waste handled through any materials recovery facility, household hazardous waste facility or composting facility within the restrictions set forth in Conditions 10, 11, and 12.
- g. The Board of Supervisors may increase the net tonnage allowed by Conditions 9d and 9e to 49,000 tons per week and 7,700 tons maximum per day if the Board of Supervisors, upon the joint recommendation of the Local Enforcement Agency and the Director of Public Works, determines that an increase is necessary to appropriately manage the overall County waste stream for the protection of the public health and safety. Not more than 355 days of overages may be given over the life of this grant.
- h. Operating hours may be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.
- i. The permittee shall operate the landfill in a manner which maximizes the amount of waste which can be placed within the available approved volume, including but not limited to the following:
  - Investigate and implement, as appropriate, methods of diverting or reducing high volume-low density materials which are not capable of being readily compacted;
  - Investigate and implement, as permitted by the appropriate regulatory agencies, methods to reduce the volume of daily cover required; and
  - Utilize waste materials received and processed at the landfill, such as shredded green waste, as a supplement to daily, intermediate and final cover, to the extent deemed technically feasible and acceptable by regulatory agencies.
- j. Notwithstanding any other provision of this grant, the permittee shall not knowingly impede or prevent the attainment of waste diversion objectives of city and county Source Reduction and Recycling Elements and the County Integrated Waste Management Plan adopted pursuant to Division 30 of the Public Resources Code.
- k. Business signs are allowed as permitted in Zone C-1.
- 1. Nothing in this Condition 9 or elsewhere in these conditions of grant shall be construed to require the permittee to engage in any act which is in violation of any state or federal regulation.

- m. The County reserves the right to exercise its police power to protect the public health, safety and general welfare by managing the county-wide waste stream, including such activities as the setting of appropriate taxes or fees.
- n. The daily waste limits specified in this Condition 9 may be varied with the approval of the Local Enforcement Agency to respond to a declared emergency.
- 10. This grant allows the establishment and operation of a materials recovery facility, subject to the following restrictions as to use:
  - a. The facility shall be no larger than 60,000 square feet in size, and shall be designed to accommodate no more than 500 tons per day of materials.
  - b. Nothing in this Condition 10 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the materials recovery facility or to otherwise modify the conditions of this grant.
  - c. Nothing in this Condition 10 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to require the permittee to engage in any act which is in violation of any state or federal regulation.
  - d. Operating hours may be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, for purposes of processing materials, operating equipment, and/or maintaining the facility.
  - e. The delivery of material to the materials recovery facility by all but commercial and municipal entities shall not occur outside the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., 7 days per week.
  - f. Vehicles removing recyclable materials from the materials recovery facility may access the facility 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.
  - g. Site development shall substantially conform to Exhibit "A", any requirements of Conditional Use permit 87360 not in conflict with the provisions of this grant, and the mitigations listed in the visual impact section of the environmental impact report for this Conditional Use Permit 89081-(5).
- 11. This grant allows the establishment and operation of a recyclable household hazardous waste facility, subject to the following restrictions as to use:
  - a. The facility may be used by the general public to drop off recyclable household hazardous wastes, including, but not limited to, used motor oil, used latex paints, used anti-freeze, and used batteries. The facility is not to be used for general use by commercial or industrial entities.

- b. The facility shall be no larger than 2,100 square feet in size, exclusive of ingress and egress.
- c. Nothing in this Condition 11 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the recyclable household hazardous waste facility or to otherwise modify the conditions of grant.
- d. Recyclable materials shall not be collected in quantities or stored for periods which would cause the need for a hazardous waste facilities permit unless such permit has already been obtained.
- e. Nothing in this Condition 11 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to require the permittee to engage in any act which is in violation of any state or federal regulation.
- f. Operating hours may be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, for purposes of processing materials, operating equipment, and/or maintaining the facility.
- g. The delivery of material to the recyclable household hazardous waste facility by members of the general public shall not occur outside the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., 7 days per week.
- h. The facility shall be staffed continuously during operating hours by an individual trained in hazardous materials management.
- i. Site development shall substantially conform to Exhibit "A", any requirements of Conditional Use Permit 87360 not in conflict with the provisions of this grant, and the mitigations listed in the visual impact section of the mitigation monitoring summary reference in the mitigation monitoring program for this Conditional Use Permit 89081-(5).
- 12. This grant allows the establishment and operation of a composting facility, using either windrow or in-vessel technology, together with certain ancillary and related activities as enumerated herein, subject to the following restrictions as to use:
  - a. The facility may be used to receive, process and compost green waste and biosolids, and to store and distribute finished mulch, biomass fuel and compost.
  - b. The facility shall consist of a receiving and processing area no more than 4 acres in size, a composting area no more than 30 acres in size, and a storage and distribution area no more than 7 acres in size.
  - c. Nothing in this Condition 12 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand

the composting facility or to otherwise modify the conditions of grant.

- d. The composting operation shall receive no more than 400 tons per day of green waste and 160 tons per day of wastewater biosolids.
- e. Nothing in this Condition 12 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to require the permittee to engage in any act which is in violation of any state or federal regulation.
- f. Operating hours may be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.
- g. Access by customers for purposes of removing finished mulch, biomass fuel and compost shall not occur outside the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., 7 days per week.
- h. All windrow areas shall be located on existing compacted landfill areas meeting all requirements of regulatory agencies for such use.
- i. The permittee shall comply with all rules for odor abatement and prevention of the South Coast Air Quality Management District and the County Department of Health Services (LEA). The permittee shall not allow odors to become a nuisance in adjacent residential areas. In the event odors become a nuisance in adjacent residential areas, permittee shall take all necessary steps to abate that nuisance. If the permittee, despite the application of the best available technology and methodology, cannot abate nuisance odors resulting from composting, the permittee shall terminate such operations.
- 13. The subject property may be used for the following ancillary facilities or activities:
  - Offices, employee facilities, and truck and equipment storage and maintenance facilities related directly to the landfill, the materials recovery facility, the composting facility, the recyclable household hazardous waste facility and/or other waste handling and processing operations allowed under this grant, but excluding offices and other facilities related to any unrelated enterprises operated by the permittee or others;
  - Leachate collection and processing facilities;
  - Facilities necessary for the collection, disposal, utilization and distribution of landfill gases as required and/or approved by the South Coast Air Quality Management District; and
  - Facilities necessary for fire protection and similar purposes.

- 14. If the landfill regularly meets its weekly and/or daily maximum limit, as set forth in Condition 9d and 9e, the permittee shall implement a program to avert wasted trips to the landfill and illegal disposal, which program shall include:
  - a. Scheduling of regular users, such as commercial and municipal haulers, to prevent them from arriving at the landfill and being diverted to other landfills; and
  - b. Reservation of capacity for small commercial and private users, unless an alternate landfill located within 15 miles of the permittee's landfill is available to accept such users.
- 15. The permittee shall implement programs if necessary to discourage trucking of partially filled loads to the landfill by commercial and municipal haulers. The permittee shall also take such measures as are necessary to prevent queuing of trucks waiting to enter the landfill on State Route 126.
- 16. The permittee shall install and/or pay for traffic improvements as set forth below, to the extent deemed warranted by the County's Department of Public Works and the California Department of Transportation. As used in this condition, "warranted" means justified on the basis of established standards of the County, the California Department of Transportation and/or by accepted traffic engineering practice. Improvements may include, as determined by the County and the California Department of Transportation:
  - a. Installation of advance entrance signs on State Route 126 on both sides of the landfill entrance notifying motorists of the approaching entrance and of the exclusive left-turn and right-turn lanes for landfill traffic;
  - b. Installation of a second incoming truck scale at the landfill entrance before acceptance of waste in the landfill expansion area or as otherwise directed by the Local Enforcement Agency. In the event the permittee or the Local Enforcement Agency determines that an additional truck scale is necessary before acceptance of waste in the expansion area, the permittee shall install a temporary truck scale as soon as reasonably feasible. Any such temporary scale shall be replaced by a permanent truck scale upon completion of any necessary permitting and construction;
  - c. Coordination with the California Department of Transportation on its State Route 126 widening project to provide for a left-turn and acceleration/deceleration lane in the center of State Route 126 near the landfill entrance;
  - d. Installation of a traffic control signal at the entrance of the landfill as may be required based on a warrant analysis approved by the California Department of Transportation;

- e. As required to serve the materials recovery facility, improve Wolcott Way from State Route 126 to the materials recovery facility site and the site frontage to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works; and
- f. Permittee's financial contribution toward the installation of a traffic control signal at the intersection of State Route 126 and Interstate 5, as may be required by a warrant analysis approved by the California Department of Transportation. Permittee's contribution shall be based on permittee's facilities' traffic impacts as a percentage of total traffic at this intersection.
- 17. Except as otherwise provided in this condition, the final landfill surface shall be concurrently reclaimed and revegetated as described in the Revegetation and Erosion Control Program (Oasis Associates, Inc. March, 1995) developed for the landfill expansion.

If the Local Enforcement Agency determines either (1) that a different design or plan would better protect the public health and safety and would enable revegetation of the final landfill surface as well as or better than the Revegetation and Erosion Control Program, and/or (2) that a change is dictated by revisions to the minimum standards adopted by the California Integrated Waste Management Board, and as a result the Local Enforcement Agency directs the implementation of a different design and/or plan, then the permittee shall not be bound by the provisions of this condition.

18. A temporary vegetation cover shall be established on all slopes and other areas that are to remain inactive for a period longer than 180 days.

The permittee shall employ expert assistance to carry out this condition. Soil sampling and laboratory analysis shall be conducted before revegetation to identify chemical or physical soil properties that may adversely affect plant growth and establishment. Soil amendments and fertilizer recommendations shall be applied and plant materials selected as indicated by the tests. To the extent possible, plant types shall blend with species indigenous to the area and be drought tolerant and shall be capable of rapid establishment. For specific requirements, see the Revegetation and Erosion Control Program (Oasis Associates, Inc., March 1995).

- 19. The permittee shall utilize the most effective available technology and methodology to avert fugitive dust emissions which may be a nuisance or hazard in adjacent populated locations or which may cause significant damage to wildland resources. In addition to the revegetation measures required in Conditions 17 and 18 and listed in the mitigation monitoring summary, the permittee shall comply with the regulations approved by the Local Enforcement Agency and the rules for dust abatement and prevention of the South Coast Air Quality Management District.
- 20. The permittee shall employ the most effective available technology and methodology to prevent litter which enters the area under the permittee's control in the form of

waste from escaping the area. The permittee's on-site litter control program shall include, unless otherwise provided by the Local Enforcement Agency, the following:

a. Landfill personnel shall regularly patrol the access road from the scales to the working face from the time it opens to the time it closes in the evening;

b. Improperly covered or contained loads which may result in a significant release of litter shall be immediately stopped and the condition corrected, if practicable, before the load proceeds to the working face. If correction cannot be made, the load shall be transported under escort to the working face.

All debris found on or along the entrance and working face access roads shall be immediately removed;

- d. Operating areas shall be located in wind shielded portions of the landfill during windy periods;
- e. The permittee shall install temporary litter fences in the operating areas, as deemed necessary by the Local Enforcement Agency to enforce the intent of this condition; and
- f. The permittee shall require open-bed trucks exiting the landfill either to be swept clean of loose debris or to be covered so as to minimize the possibility of litter escaping onto State Route 126.
- 21. The permittee shall, to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and the Local Enforcement Agency, maintain programs aimed at controlling the discharge and recovery of litter from uncovered or improperly covered or contained loads traveling to the landfill.

The measures shall include an effective tarping program, which if necessary in the estimation of the Director of Public Works and the Local Enforcement Agency, shall provide for mandatory sale of tarps to violators and/or punitive fees and exclusion from the landfill of repeated violators.

The permittee shall post a sign at the entry gate at State Route 126 which indicates the following:

22.

- a. The telephone number by which persons may on a 24-hour basis contact the permittee to register complaints and/or comments regarding landfill operations;
- b. The telephone number of the Local Enforcement Agency and the hours when the number is manned; and
- c. The telephone number of the enforcement offices Quality Management District and the hours when
- 23. The permittee shall at all times during operating hours in promptly respond to litter and other complaints from the surrou
- 24. Except as otherwise provided in this condition, areas outside of and auand fill shown on Exhibit A (including borrow areas) shall not be graded or sindisturbed to create the landfill areas approved in Condition 9b or new soil stockpiareas or disturbed areas for construction staging not shown on Exhibit A. The Director of Public Works may approve additional grading if the Director determines, based upon engineering studies provided by the permittee and independently evaluated by the Director, that such additional grading or disturbance is necessary for slope stability or drainage purposes or for soil stockpiling or construction staging. Such a determination shall be documented as provided in Part I of the attached monitoring program.

In the case of soil stockpiling and staging areas not shown on Exhibit "A" or located within the approved fill area, the permittee shall submit a letter from a qualified biologist certifying that the affected area is not a location of biological sensitivity as identified in the project environmental impact report. No approval shall be granted under this condition which will result in expanding the area or height of fill or in lowering or significantly modifying any of the ridgelines surrounding the landfill.

Nothing in this condition shall be construed as prohibiting the installation of water tanks, access roads, flares, or similar facilities or mitigation programs required by this grant or by permits issued by other public agencies.

- 25. The permittee shall implement a program to identify and conserve any significant archaeological or paleontological materials which may be present in accord with this condition. If any evidence of such materials is discovered during earth moving activities, landfill operations shall cease in that immediate area and said area shall be preserved until a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist has made a determination as to the significance of the site or findings. Any significant archaeological or paleontological resources shall be recovered, to the extent practicable, before resuming activities in that area of the landfill.
- 26. The permittee shall implement a comprehensive waste load checking program designed to exclude disposal of liquid and hazardous wastes and radioactive material at the landfill, which program shall comply with the requirements of this condition and Part III of the attached monitoring program and any additional requirements of the Local Enforcement Agency, the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

Restrictions on disposal of radioactive material and hazardous and liquid wastes and the procedures for proper disposal at other appropriately classified disposal sites or waste processing facilities shall be provided to waste haulers on a routine basis. Notices shall also be posted at prominent locations at the landfill to inform waste haulers of the rules governing the disposal of liquid and hazardous waste, and radioactive material.

In the event that material known or suspected to be hazardous waste or radioactive material is discovered at the landfill, the permittee's agent shall:

- a. If the vehicle that delivered the waste is still present, attempt to identify the driver and obtain his driver's license number and vehicle's license number;
- b. Immediately make all required notifications to State and County agencies; and
- c. If possession of the material is not immediately taken by a public official, store the material at a site developed in accord with the regulations of the California Environmental Protection Agency and the Regional Water Quality Control Board until disposed of in accord with applicable State and Federal Regulations.

The permittee shall also provide effective vector control measures as directed by the County Department of Health Services.

Nothing in this condition shall be construed to permit the maintenance of a hazardous waste disposal facility at the landfill.

- 27. The permittee shall contact the Department of Public Works to determine whether an Industrial Waste Disposal Permit is required. No activity for which a permit is required shall be initiated on the subject property before a permit is obtained and any required facilities are installed. The permittee shall keep any required permits in full force and effect and shall fully comply with any requirements thereof.
- 28. The permittee shall install drainage structures and comply with all other drainage requirements of the Department of Public Works and any additional requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and any other regulatory agency with appropriate jurisdiction. Except as specifically otherwise provided by the Department of Public Works, all drainage structures, including sedimentation basins, shall be designed and constructed so as to accommodate run-off from a capital storm.

The landfill and drainage structures shall in all cases be designed so as to cause surface water to be diverted away from disposal areas.

The permittee shall further comply with all grading requirements of the Department of Public Works and County Ordinance.

- 29. The permittee shall install and maintain containment (liner) systems and leachate collection and removal systems as approved and required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 30. The permittee shall install and test ground water monitoring wells as required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and shall promptly undertake any action directed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to correct or prevent contamination which may affect ground water quality or water conveyance or storage facilities. Any testing or remedial actions deemed necessary by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to correct or prevent contamination or to determine the existence of any contamination from the existing landfill operated by the permittee which, in the opinion of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, should be completed or guaranteed before commencement of landfill expansion shall be completed or guaranteed by the permittee before commencement of the expansion to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 31. The permittee shall maintain on-site fire response capabilities, construct access roads, provide water tanks, water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows and perform brush clearance to the satisfaction of the County Forester and Fire Warden.
- 32. All on-site fuel storage tanks shall be installed and necessary containment and air quality controls provided in accord with the requirements of the County Forester and Fire Warden, the County Department of Public Works, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District.
- 33. The permittee shall take all necessary measures to ensure that noise emissions from the on-site facilities at any residential receptor are within the limits of the County Noise Ordinance, as contained in Title 12 of the County Code.
- 34. Unless otherwise authorized by the South Coast Air Quality Management District, the permittee shall install and maintain a best available control technology landfill gas collection system in compliance with the requirements of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The permittee shall also control the lateral migration of gases to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works, the Local Enforcement Agency, the California Integrated Waste Management Board and the South Coast Air Quality Management District, as applicable.
- 35. Landfill gas flares shall be below the adjacent ridges and the flames shall be totally contained within the stack, unless otherwise required by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Flame arresters shall be provided to the satisfaction of the County Forester and Fire Warden.
- 36. The permittee shall adopt and implement operational practices to mitigate vehicular and other air quality impacts as required by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

13

- 37. The permittees shall operate the on-site facilities in a manner which conserves water, including but not limited to the following:
  - a. The permittee shall investigate the feasibility of treating collected leachate onsite for reuse in the landfill and shall, if feasible and approved by the appropriate agencies, implement a program to utilize such water;
  - b. Soil sealant, pavement and other control measures shall be used wherever possible in preference to water for dust control; and
  - c. Drought-tolerant plants shall be used to the extent possible to revegetate.
- 38. The permittee shall comply with any applicable provisions of Sections 1601-1603 of the California Fish and Game Code and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act before alteration of drainage courses and shall mitigate any disturbed wetland habitat or jurisdictional habitat to the satisfaction of the California Department of Fish and Game and/or the United States Army Corps of Engineers, as applicable.
- 39. To the extent permitted by law, the Local Enforcement Agency shall have the authority to order the immediate cessation of landfilling or other activities at the site if it determines that the health, safety and/or welfare of the inhabitants of the County of Los Angeles so requires. Such cessation shall continue until such time as the Local Enforcement Agency determines that the conditions leading to the cessation have been eliminated or reduced to a level which no longer poses an unacceptable threat to such health, safety and/or welfare.
- 40. In order to undertake and administer planning studies for unincorporated communities in the vicinity of the landfill, the permittee shall pay to the Department of Regional Planning \$75,000 on July 1, 1998, \$75,000 on July 1, 1999, and \$100,000 on July 1, 2000. In order to provide funding for community planning needs as identified by such planning studies, the permittee shall pay to the Department of Regional Planning \$30,000 per annum commencing July 1, 2001 and continuing each July 1 for the life of this grant applicable to the landfill. The funds received shall be placed in an interest bearing trust account until used for the specified purposes.
- 41. The permittee shall pay to the County of Los Angeles a fee equal to ten percent (10%) of the sum of the following:
  - The net tipping fees collected at the landfill (excluding any tipping fees received for waste processed at the materials recovery, recyclable household hazardous waste and composting facilities approved in Conditions 10, 11 and 12), the net tipping fee being the total collected less any other fees or taxes imposed by any federal, state or local agency and included in the fee charged at the landfill entrance;
  - Gas to energy or direct gas sale revenues, less any federal, state or local fees

or taxes included in such revenues.

Should the County impose a business tax on landfill revenues, the amount received from the permittee shall be credited against the fees required by this Condition 41.

42. As agreed, the permittee shall make a good faith effort to establish and maintain, based on, among other things, economic viability, the materials recovery and recyclable household hazardous waste facilities approved in Conditions 10 and 11.

Rev. 9-11-96





#### MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Joanne Sturges, Executive Officer Clerk of the Board of Supervisors 383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration Los Angeles, California 90012

County Counsel Director of Planning

At its meeting held February 25, 1997, the Board took the following action:

#### 11

At the time and place regularly set, notice having been duly given, the following item was called up:

De novo hearing on Conditional Use Permit Case No. 89-081-(5), and on certification of Environmental Impact Report relating to the authorization and the continued operation and expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill located at 29201 Henry Mayo Dr., Newhall Zoned District, applied for by Rodney Walter for Laidlaw Waste Systems. (Appeals from Regional Planning Commission's approval)

Frank Meneses, representing the Department of Regional Planning, was duly sworn and testified. Opportunity was given for opponents and proponents to address the Board. Interested persons addressed the Board. Written correspondence was presented.

Supervisor Antonovich made the following statement:

"I am pleased to announce that an agreement on this case has been reached between the applicant and the Val Verde Civic Association to allow the continued use of the landfill. The basic' provisions of the agreement call for the applicant to provide additional significant mitigations and the funding of a Val Verde Community Benefit Fund in exchange for seven additional years to the life of the new permit and 5 million tons in additional capacity. (A copy of the signed agreement is attached.)

(Continued on Page 2)

-1-

#### Syn. 11 (Continued)

"The Board should accept this agreement and approve the development pursuant to this agreement. Like all agreements of this type, it does not give everyone everything they sought. Yet, there are some significant benefits for each of the signatories. The applicant has, for example, agreed to ban the acceptance of sludge at this site. He has also agreed to work with the Val Verde community to protect the views from surrounding properties and to limit his hours when he will accept refuse, among other items. He also agrees to fund a Community Benefit Fund for \$250,000 during the first year if stated disposal thresholds are achieved. That amount would increase each year by 2% through the 22nd year.

"Before moving approval of this item, i would like to acknowledge the efforts of all of those involved in the negotiations for their willingness to come together on this issue. I would particularly like to thank Ms. Lynn Harris from the City of Santa Clarita for her work as an intermediary in these discussions. She was very instrumental in the finalizing of this deal, and I would like to thank her for all of her hard work on this matter."

Therefore, on motion of Supervisor Antonovich, seconded by Supervisor Knabe, unanimously carried (Supervisor Yaroslavsky being absent), the hearing was closed and the Board took the following actions:

- Indicated for the record that the Board has read the environmental documentation including the statement of overriding considerations as recommended by the Regional Planning Commission and that the Board's tentative decision is based upon that review;
- Indicated its intent to approve Conditional Use Permit Case No. 89-081-(5), pursuant to the attached agreement reached between Laidlaw Waste Systems and the Val Verde Civic Association;
- Instructed the Director of Planning to prepare the necessary environmental findings for final certification of the Environmental Impact Report; and

(Continued on Page 3)

-2-

^n0086

#### Syn. 11 (Continued)

d. Instructed County Counsel to prepare the findings and conditions including a mechanism to ensure that the community benefit fund is administered by a body representing the interest of the entire community such as, for example, an elected board or a joint powers agency.

#### 022597.11

#### Attachment

Copies distributed:

Each Supervisor Director of Internal Services Director of Public Works Laidlaw Waste Systems Jose Luis Vega Newhall Co. Water District City of Santa Clarita Clean Water Action United Water Conservation Dist. Merry Farmer Charles Leonard Cindy Sterns Lynne Plambeck Ken Emerald Cynthia Valdez

|          |                                       |                             | and a second sec |  |   |
|----------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|
|          | PEB.24.1                              | 997 N10: 180% NE            | WHOLL LANDEFARMING (825)   | 2554489  | NO. 352 P. 1/15   |
|          |                                       | A NOLE TOTA                 | The second second  | HIL OF Pages / 5 .Tod  |   |
|          | io /                                  | 115 TALLA                   | nulla,   | Free States  | 14-17 Jack  |
|          | Corpey 1-575                          | and n                       | H.//   | Stary (  | MAUMANO :   |
| •        | Longor,                               |                             | monouces off   | NL7  |   |
|          | 67.14                                 |                             |  |  | · Dupt, Ourge   |
|          | 213-9                                 | 74-1010 3                   | 12-976-5555  | NCP  | Children and a start and a star |
|          | Comercia                              |                             | id   |  | 05- 255-4030  |
|          | ar tabligandik                        |                             | 10<br>10<br>10   | Loterar Coursy   | Catter picko  |
|          | and an address of the state of the    |                             |  |  |   |
|          | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                             |  |  | and a second  |
|          |                                       | an familie :                |  |  | an a  |
|          |                                       |                             | the second methods a suggest to the the desired a  | A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL PROPERTY A REAL PRO | and the state of t  |
|          |                                       | a an an an an an an an an   | ——————————————————————————————————————   | e de sell'é annes : anne ann   |   |
|          | 1                                     |                             | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  | e a an prosperation e e dar  | · ···· ····   |
|          | ·                                     |                             |  |  |   |
|          | 1                                     |                             |  |  |   |
|          |                                       |                             |  |  |   |
|          |                                       | -                           |  |  |   |
|          |                                       |                             | HIQUITA CANYON LA  | NDFILL EXPANSION   |   |
|          | 1                                     |                             | D RELATED FACILITY   | es project 389-08  | 1 A Bring No  |
|          | 1                                     |                             |  | '  | I HA  |
|          | 5                                     | TATEMENT OF                 | GREEMENTS AND TH   | DEDET AND DOCO   |   |
|          | -                                     |                             |  | DERSTANDINGS BY  | AND BETWEEN   |
|          |                                       |                             | NEWHALL LAND AN  | D FARMING CO   |   |
|          |                                       | LA                          | DLAW WASTE SYSTE   | VIS (CHIOTITTA) INC  | •   |
|          |                                       |                             | VAL VERDE CIVIC  | ASSOCIATION  | **  |
|          |                                       |                             |  |  |   |
|          |                                       |                             |  |  |   |
|          | 1.                                    | Laidlaw agrees to           | add the name of a contact p  | erson, phone number, p   | bysical and electronic  |
| 1        |                                       | addresses, and the          | contact person's supervisor  | to each entity identified  | in the February 1997  |
|          |                                       | document entitled           | :  |  | ,   |
|          |                                       | 4170 a seu 1 - a -          |  |  |   |
|          |                                       | Reguisto                    | ry Process for the Permitt   | ing of the Landfill con  | ansion and Material   |
|          |                                       | Fatimery                    | Pacifics and a Descript  | bon of the General R   | legulatory Oversight  |
|          |                                       | ZNVIIOIIIII                 | an During Normal Operatio  | )ns"   |   |
|          | 2.                                    | All narries agree to        | verify and manages the an  | what the at  |   |
|          |                                       | of the annual Com           | munity Benefe Dund (Ama  | acaca ust of approved y  | possible expenditures   |
|          |                                       | Association shall a         | scent and spend the funds w  | ithin its mining 601C2   | ree Val Verde Civic   |
|          |                                       | to include a repres         | entative from Laidlaw, New   | whall I and and Farming  | Co. and the Course  |
|          |                                       | of Los Angeles Fit          | th District Supervisor's Of  | fice.  | Co., and the County   |
|          |                                       |                             |  |  |   |
|          | 3.                                    | Laidlaw agrees to p         | articipate in good faith, on a   | regular basis, with the (  | Community Advisory  |
|          |                                       | Committee and to            | assist wherever possible   | in furthering commun   | ication between the   |
|          |                                       | community of Va             | Verde and the landfill,  | including information  | sharing, education,   |
|          |                                       | understanding of la         | adfill operations, and respon  | se to calls. Laidlaw furt  | her agrees to forward   |
|          |                                       | all nonces and rep          | ports from or to its regula  | tory agencies to the Co  | mmunity Advisory  |
|          |                                       | Coldinatice within          | live dusiness days of receip   | t of transmittal.  |   |
|          | 4.                                    | Val Vende Civic As          | constinue to example the   | · Poord of Cusandarus  |   |
|          |                                       | 25, 1997, and give          | oral and written testimony   | to board of Supervisors  | caning on February  |
|          |                                       |                             | was officer of a second of the second o      | was men concerns have  | DCCII SZUSTICC.   |
|          | 5.                                    | Vai Verde Civic As          | sociation agrees to oppose a   | ny action by my many to  | dem: (77 19 00 001  |
|          |                                       | (5) during the appea        | is process and subsequent re   | pulatory annoval proces  |   |
|          |                                       | the Val Verde Civic         | Association is solely respo  | asible for defining how  | its opposition taken  |
|          |                                       | place. Val Verde C.         | ivic Association further agree   | cs to support the continu  | 13 opposition cakes   |
|          |                                       | of existing CUP 18          | 09-5 should this become ne   | cessary herause the net  | milles is percluded   |
|          |                                       | from operating unde         | r proposed CUP 89-081 25   | a result of a lawsuit.   | natioe is precibiled  |
|          | -                                     |                             |  |  |   |
|          | 6.                                    | The parties agree o         | ommunity benefit funds sh  | all be dispersed accord  | ing to the attached   |
|          |                                       | rayment Schedule (          | Attachment B).   |  | une en anos anastaticidad   |
|          |                                       |                             |  | •  |   |
|          | Chiquan C                             | anyon Landfill Expansor - 1 | age 1  |  | 1. PAT  |
|          |                                       |                             |  |  | TO UL   |
|          |                                       |                             |  |  | Heine   |
|          |                                       |                             |  |  | G. n. n.  |
| 04       | AP                                    | 0 5 1007                    |  |  | pu-   |
| ×1V# 1 1 | UF FER                                | 2 3 1997                    |  |  | n0088   |
|          | FE3-24-1997                           | 28:28                       | 8252554489   | 76%  | 2 01  |
|          |                                       |                             |  |  |   |

- All conditions of CUP 89-081 (5) shall remain as approved by the Regional Planning Commission except as noted in Attachment C, Proposed Modification for Board of Supervisors' Anticipated Action 2/25/97.
- 8. Val Verde Civic Association agrees no funds received at any time as a result of approval of CUP 89-081 shall be used in any manner against the good name or activities of The Newhall Land and Farming Co. and its subsidiaries, the landfill operator, and/or landowner, in any way.
  - Val Verde Civic Association agrees to accept the Memorandum of Understanding between Laidlaw and the United Water Conservation District as mitigation of water issues, Laidlaw agrees to provide the Community Advisory Committee with any and all reports, data, and information provided to the District from the landfill and/or provided by the District to the landfill.
- Laidlaw and Newhall Land and Farming Co. agree to legally bind all successors in interest in all conditions of approval of CUP 89-081 (5) and all agreements between the parties. Val Verde Civic Association agrees to execute the legal documents needed to accomplish this and any other documents needed for the fulfillment of these agreements and understandings.
- 11. If any term or provision of this Statement of Agreements and Understandings ("Agreement") is determined to be invalid or unenforceable, the remaining terms and provisions shall not be affected thereby and shall remain in full force and effect to the maximum extent permitted by law.
- 12. If any party to this Agreement is a corporation, trust, general or limited partnership, or community organization, each individual executing this Agreement on behalf of such entity represents and warrants that he or she is duly authorized to execute and deliver this Agreement on behalf of said entity.

Dated: February 21, 1997

LAIDLAW WASTE SYSTEMS (CHIQUITA), INC.

They W. Whater By: Printed Name: RODNEY W. WALTER I Title: GENE

Dated: February ZI, 1997

NEWHALL LAND AND FARMING CO.

unsump ??? By: J Printed Name: all Cursuanic Title: Vaside, R

••

Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion - Page 2 H:CHIQUITA/VALVERDE.3

℃N# 1 1 OF FFR 2 5 1997

10089 P.22

8252554489

97%

Dated: February 24 1997

VAL VERDE CIVIC ASSOCIATION

By: Printed Name C Title: 25 in

Dated: February 24 1997

Chiqoita Canyon Landfill Expansion - Page 3 HUCHIQUITAIVALVERDE3

°VN#11 OF FEB 2 8 1997

FEB-24-1997 08:29

6252554489 97%

•\*

0000000 =.23

#### ATTACHMENT A

## VAL VERDE COMMUNITY BENEFITS FUNDS

# LIST OF PERMITTED EXPENDITURES

A. General Community Welfare

adults and sener

1. Increase opportunities for the children and youth of the community

Examples:

- a. Bi-lingual education
  - b. Headstart type programs
  - c. Computer training
  - d. Literacy skills enhancement
  - e. Increased library services
- f. Equipment for above
- 2. Increase access to health services

Examples:

- : a. Increased availability of Sam Dixon clinic services
  - b. Indigent care programs
  - c. Teen pregnancy programs
  - d. Transportation to medical services
- 3. Promote programs and activities for youth and "at risk" youth

Examples:

- a. Youth sports, such as Midnight Basketball
- b. Youth education
- c. Job skills training
- d. Participation in Sheriff's "at risk" programs
- B. Capital Investment Programs
  - 1. Aesthetic improvements

Examples:

- a. Rehabilitation of existing publicly owned or non-profit organization owned buildings
- b. Construction of new community buildings such as library, senior center
- c. Maintenance of buildings

o. Landscacin

VAL VERDE COMMUNITY BENEFITS FUNDS H: CHIQUITA VALVERDE 2 - Page :

SVN# 11 OF FFR 2 5 1997

FEB-24-1997 08:29

8052554489

97%

ccc091

°Viv# 11

## C. Administration

1. Costs associated with gathering community input on level of expenditures and furthering understanding in the community of the Community Benefit Fund

Examples: a. Advertising and convening public meetings or forums

- b. Translation services
- c. Recordation of input
- 2. Costs associated with accountability of funds received and funds spent

| Examples: | 2  | Audits                                   |
|-----------|----|--|
|           | Ъ. | Production of annual financial statement |
|           | c, | Tax filings                              |

3. Leveraging of funds

| Examples: | a, | Matching grant programs     |
|-----------|----|-----------------------------|
|           | Ъ. | Public/private partnerships |

- 4. Technical consultant assistance to address items A, B and C above
  - Examples: a. Completion of administrative functions above b. Contract compliance for community welfare programs

The parties agree any expansion or addition of items to this list requires written approval of the Newhall Land and Farming Co., the landfill operator, the landfill owner, and the Val Verde Civic Association.

| Dated: February ZL 1997   | LAIDLAW WASTES  | YSTEMS (CHIQUITA), IN | C.       |
|---|---|-----------------------|----------|
|   | By: Colue<br>Printed Name: Colue<br>Title: 6                        | White white T         |          |
| Dated: February 21, 1997  | NEWHALL LAND AN   | ID FARMING CO         |          |
|   | By: Here M (<br>Printed Name: 66 R.C.<br>Title:                     | 1 the Cusumanto       |          |
| Dated: February 24, 1997  | VAL VERDE CIVIC A   | SSOCIATION.           |          |
|   | By: <u>Rither</u><br>Printed Name: <u>Ric</u><br>Title: <u>FRES</u> | An P. GRIFFIN<br>en T |          |
|   |   |                       | - V ffer |
| VAL VERDE COMMUNITY BENEFITS FUNDS<br>H:\CHIQUITA\VALVERDE.2 - Page 2 |   |                       | PV 1     |
| 1 OF FEB 2 5 1997   |   |                       | 000035   |
| FEB-24-1997 08:29   | 6252554489  | 97%                   | P.25     |

Printed Names FARMER Title: CHAIRPER

VAL VERDE COMMUNITY BENEFITS FUNDS H:CHQUITA/VALVERDE2 - Page 3

VIN# 1 1 OF FEB 2 5 1997

8252554489

97%

\*\*

^^^**0** 

#### ATTACHMENT B

# VAL VERDE COMMUNITY BENEFITS FUND PAYMENT SCHEDULE

| CALENDAR<br>YEAR | 250,000 TON<br>OWNER | SOR MORE<br>OPERATOR | LESS THAN 2 | 50,000 TONS<br>OPERATOR |
|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Year 1           | \$125,000            | \$125,000            | \$12,500    | <b>S</b> 12,500         |
| Year 2           | 127,500              | 127,500              | 12,750      | 12,750                  |
| Year 3           | 130,050              | 130,050              | 13,005      | 13,005                  |
| Year 4           | 132,651              | 132,651              | 13,265      | 13,265                  |
| Year 5           | 135,304              | 135,304              | 13,530      | 13,530                  |
| Year 6           | 138,010              | 138,010              | 13,801      | 13,801                  |
| Year 7           | 140,770              | 140,770              | 14,077      | 14,077                  |
| Year 8           | 143,586              | 143,586              | 14,359      | 14,359                  |
| Year 9           | 146,457              | 146,457              | 14,646      | 14,646                  |
| Year 10          | 149,387              | 149,387              | 14,939      | 14,939                  |
| Year 11          | 152,374              | 152,374              | 15,237      | 15,237                  |
| Year 12          | 155,422              | 155,422              | 15,542      | 15,542                  |
| Year 13          | 158,530              | 158,530              | 15,853      | 15,853                  |
| Year 14          | 161,701              | 161,701              | 16,170      | 16,170                  |
| Year 15          | 164,935              | 164,935              | 16,493      | 16,493                  |
| Year 16          | 168,234              | 168,234              | 16,823      | 16,823                  |
| Year 17          | 171,598              | 171,598              | 17,160      | 17,160                  |
| Year 18          | 175,030              | 175,030              | 17,503      | 17,503                  |
| Year 19          | 178,531              | 178,531              | 17,853      | 17,853                  |
| Year 20          | 182,101              | 182,101              | 18,210      | 18,210                  |
| Year 21          | 185,743              | 185,743              | 18,574      | 18,574                  |
| í car 22         | 189,458              | 189,458              | 18,946      | 18,946                  |

Notes: 1. Actual payment to be determined according to the actual tonnage landfilled during the previous calendar year.

2. The Year 1 payment may be pro-rated so as to have all remaining payments paid on the calendar year.

HICHIQUITAVATTACHE VV

~VN# 11 OF FEB 2 5 1997 FEB-24-1997

٦

6052554489

97%

P.87

#### ATTACHMENT C

### CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION AND RELATED FACILITIES, PROJECT #89-081 (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 92071053)

## PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO CUP 89 081-(5) CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND MONITORING PROGRAM

# REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION 9/11/96 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ANTICIPATED ACTION 2/25/97

Pgs. 1 & 2, Conditions of Project Approval Condition for I Use Permit 89-081-(5), #5 is modified as follows:

5. Delete November 24, 2012 Add November 24, 2019

# Page 3, Condition #9 is modified as follows:

- 9a. Add The Landfill shall not accept sludge or sludge components at any time.
- 9b. Add The existing viewshed from Chiquito Canyon Road as presented pictorially to the Board of Supervisors on 2/25/97 shall be protected for the life of the project. The dip in the natural ridgeline along the western boundary shall be maintained or enhanced. Any structure placed on the landfill site, including but not limited to temporary storage areas, any materials recovery facility, composting facility or any other ancillary facilities that may be visible from Chiquito Canyon Road shall be designed to be harmonious with the natural topography and viewshed and shall be reviewed by the Community Advisory Committee.
  - Add The landfill operator and the Community Advisory Committee shall work together to prepare a tree planting and maintenance plan for the entire western boundary of the site. The objectives of the plan are to screen landfill operations, enhance the viewshed, establish the minimum number and type of trees necessary to do this and to provide adequate access to monitoring wells. Trees may be planted on slopes on either side of the ridgeline provided the above objectives are met and such planting is practical.
- 9d. Delete 35,000 tons per week and 7 working days
  - Add
- 30,000 tons per week and 6 working days

Proposed Modifications to CUP 89 051-(5) Conditions of Approval and Monitoring Program Page 1- C

OVN# 11 OF FEB 2 : 1097

FEB-24-1997 08:30

6252554489

97%

P.29

HICKOUTTAIOCOTAA

### PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO CUP 89 081-(5) CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND MONITORING PROGRAM

 9g. Add
 Nothing in this condition shall permit the maximum landfill capacity of 23 million tons to be increased.

9h. Delete sentence as written.

Add "The landfill shall not accept refuse for disposal from 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays through 4:00 a.m. on Mondays. Maintenance activities may occur during these times.

Page 6, Condition #12 is modified as follows:

12a. Second line, the word "biosolids" is deleted.

Page 7, Condition #12 is modified as follows:

12d is deleted and replaced by:

12d. The composting operation shall receive no more than 560 tons per day of green waste and no waste water biosolids (e.g., sludge or sludge components).

Page 9, Condition #20 is modified as follows:

20e is deleted and replaced by:

20e. The landfill operator shall install and maintain temporary litter fences in operating areas and in those areas along the property perimeter that are regularly littered due to the location of the operating area, time of year, and climatic conditions. The landfill operator and the Community Advisory Committee shall work together to identify littered areas in need of fencing.

Add 20g. The landfill operator shall install speed bumps on landfill property in paved areas along the route of trucks leaving the landfill. The purpose of the speed bumps is to knock out dirt and debris accumulated in wheel wells before trucks leave the site.

Proposed Modifications to CUP 89 081-(5) Conditions of Approval and Monitoring Program Page 2- C

HIDROUTADOOTAANU P.29

FEB-24-1997 08:31

OF FFR 2 5 1497

°″N# 11

6052554499

97%

### PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO CUP 89 081-(5) CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Add 20h. Landfill personnel shall police Chiquito Canyon Road from SR 126 to the entrance to Val Verde at Rancho Avilos and the surrounding area within 100 feet of the centerline of the road or to any existing fence on private property for the purpose of locating and cleaning up litter in this area. Litter pickup shall be a minimum of one time per month and may be increased, upon agreement between the landfill operator and the Community Advisory Committee, to maintain a litter free environment.

Add 20i. The landfill operator shall provide four free quarterly clean-up days to residents of Val Verde, showing proper identification and proof of residence at the landfill. These days may be Sundays. The operator shall further reimburse the Community Advisory Committee for the cost of providing two rolloff bins in Val Verde on each clean-up day. The operator and Committee may jointly change this program if they mutually determine alternatives to the above can further assist the community.

Page 11, Condition #23 is modified to:

Add The permittee shall have bilingual (Spanish/English) employees available during business hours. The permittee shall arrange to have Spanish speaking operators available for messages 24 hours per day.

Page 13, Condition #34 is modified to:

- Add The permittee shall use his best efforts to maximize landfill gas collection consistent with applicable government regulations. The permittee shall use the best available technology when installing and maintaining landfill gas collection systems.
- Add Permittee shall purchase a maximum of five combustible gas monitors, at least one of which is able to be used outdoors, an organic vapor analyzer, similar to the monitors used in structures at the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, and provide same to the Community Advisory Committee for placement in locations of concern to the community, as determined by the Committee. These monitors are designed to detect and provide warning in the event of a build-up of methane gas. The Committee shall be responsible for locating, monitoring and maintaining such monitors. In the event such monitors indicate discernible levels of methane gas, the Committee and the landfill operator shall jointly investigate the situation and if it is determined that the

Proposed Modifications to CUP 89 081-(5) Conditions of Approval and Monitoring Program. Page 3- C

21/11 OF FEB 2 2 1997

FEB-24-1997 08:31

6252554489

97%

MICOCOLITACTOTAAA SI



### PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO CUP 89 081-(5) CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND MONITORING PROGRAM

landfill is the cause of such methane gas build-up, the landfill operator will take corrective action.

Add The permittee shall work with the Citizens Advisory Committee in understanding the requirements of Rule 1150.1 governing the control of gaseous emissions from active landfills. The permittee shall forward copies of any notices or reports filed with or received from the regulatory agency or agencies responsible for oversight.

Page 15, Condition #42

As directed by the

Pur Add The permittee shall perform an economic viability and marketing study on an annual basis to assess opportunities to implement a materials recovery facility in an expeditious manner. Norming in this could find swell marchete the permittee to mplement a materials recovery facility in an expeditious manner. Norming in this could find swell marchete the permittee to mplement a materials recovery facility in an Page 15, New Condition #43:

Add The permittee shall present its Emergency Response Plan to the Community Advisory Committee and develop an additional component with the Committee for emergency notification to the Val Verde community. The landfill operator shall bear the reasonable costs, if any, of plan implementation.

New Condition #44

Add

The permittee and the land owner shall establish an ongoing Val Verde Community Benefits Fund for the life of the project as follows:

The minimum funding provided during any annual period when the landfill has accepted less than 250,000 tons of waste for disposal in the previous calendar year shall be \$12,500 from the owner and \$12,500 from the operator. If the landfill is accepting waste for disposal during any annual period and accepted 250,000 tons of waste for disposal or more in the previous calendar year, the funding to be paid for that annual period will be \$125,000 from the owner and \$125,000 from the operator. The funding amount shall be adjusted, 2% per year.

Condition # 44 Mary be mine Appropriete in the Statesterit of Aquin is AS ide = # 13

Proposed Modifications to CUP 89 081-(5) Conditions of Approval and Monitoring Program Page 4- C

°VN# 1 1

OF FER 2 5 1097

FEB-24-1997 09:32

8652554489

97%

HIORQUITANORQTAAA

# PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO CUP 89 081-(5)

# CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND MONITORING PROGRAM

The commencement date for provision of funds shall be the later of (1) January 1. 1998 or (2) the date upon which all of the County approvals and the subsequent approvals are complete and effective and no appeals, litigation or other challenges to such approvals are pending or permitted pursuant to applicable statutes of limitation.

The payment for the first year may be pro-rated so as to have all subsequent payments made on a calendar year basis.

New Condition #45:

Add The permittee shall purchase translation equipment as specified by the Val Verde Civic Association for a one time cost not to exceed \$8,000, by or before the first payment is made in Condition #44.

New Condition #46

Add The maximum total capacity of the landfill shall be 23 million tons. Landfill closure shall occur when this capacity is reached or by November 24, 2019, whichever occurs first.

New Condition #47

Add In the event that permittee is precluded from utilizing this grant as a result of a lawsuit, permittee may continue to operate the existing landfill under CUP 1809-(5) beyond the November 24, 1997 expiration date applicable to, and subject to all other conditions and limitations set forth in CUP 1809-(5) until completion of the design shown on the latest approved Exhibit A on file with CUP 1809-(5) or November 24, 2000, or until lawsuit resolution granting this CUP 89 081-(5), which ever occurs first.

Proposed Modifications to CUP 89 081-(5) Conditions of Approval and Menitoring Program Page 5- C

H. OROUTAVOROTA

SYN# 1 1 OF FER 2 5 1997

FEB-24-1997 08:32

6252554489

97%

puro

#### CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL EXPANSION AND RELATED FACILITIES, PROJECT #89-081 (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 92071053)

#### PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO CUP 89 081-(5) CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND MONITORING PROGRAM

#### MONITORING PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS

Page 2, Attachment to Conditions, Monitoring Program, Part I Landfill Elevations, A, third line, shall be modified to read as follows:

"... the permittee shall install permanent survey monuments ..."

Pages 7 and 8, Attachment to Conditions, Part VIL, Monitoring Reports, shall be modified as follows:

Add The Community Advisory Committee shall receive a copy of the completed report and agency comments upon submittal to the Regional Planning Commission. All reports section will be forwarded to the Community Community Community The permittee and its technical staff shall be available to present the findings and 5 implications of the report at no cost, in a timely manner, to the Community Advisory Workin Committee upon request.

Page 9 - Attachment to Conditions, Part VIII, Community Advisory Committee, shall be modified as follows:

Add "The committee shall be comprised of a majority of persons who reside in Val Verde.

Delete "persons who reside in the vicinity of the site."

Page 9, Part VIII, #3

| Delete | \$11 | 000 | per | annum |
|--------|------|-----|-----|-------|
|        |      |     |     |       |

Add \$20,000 per annum

Proposed Modifications to CUP 89 081-(5) Conditions of Approval and Monitoring Program Page 6- C

2VIN# 1 1 OF FER 2 5 1097

FEB-24-1997 08:32

2252554489

97%

HACHOULTAN







COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL 648 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION 500 WEST TEMPLE STREET LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

DE WITT W. CLINTON, COUNTY COUNSEL

May 9, 1997

TELEPHONE (213) 974-1921 TELECOPIER

(213) 617-7182

Syn. No. 11 2/25/97

Honorable Board of Supervisors 383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration Los Angeles, California 90012

## Re: Conditional Use Permit Number 89-081(5) Fifth Supervisorial District / 3-vote Matter

Dear Supervisors:

Your Board recently conducted a hearing on an appeal relating to the approval of the above-entitled zoning permit which proposes the expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill in the Newhall Zoned District.

At the conclusion of the hearing, you rendered a preliminary order to approve the permit as revised with revised conditions and instructed us to prepare findings and conditions for approval. Such findings and conditions are attached hereto.

Very truly yours,

DE WITT W. CLINTON County Counsel

Bv

RICHARD D. WEISS Principal Deputy County Counsel

APPROVED AND RELEASED:

DE WITT W. CLINTON County Counsel A:VCUP89081.LTR

# FINDINGS OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND ORDER CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NUMBER 89-081(5)

- 1. The Chiquita Canyon landfill is an existing Class III waste disposal facility located on the north side of State Route 126 westerly of Interstate 5, in the vicinity of the community of Val Verde. The landfill is operated by Laidlaw Waste Systems on land leased from the Newhall Land and Farming Company. The landfill commenced operation in 1972. Laidlaw acquired its interest in the facility in 1986.
- 2. The Chiquita Canyon facility has operated under a series of zoning entitlements. The most recent of these is Conditional Use Permit 1809-(5), approved November 24, 1982. This permit expires on November 24, 1997. However, the operator estimates that at the current intake rate, about 25 months of disposal capacity (1,090,000 tons) would remain in the approved landfill design at the time of permit expiration on November 24, 1997.
- 3. Conditional Use Permit 1809-(5) allows waste to be accepted at Chiquita Canyon 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Use during night time hours is limited to commercial and public waste haulers and a maximum of 15 trucks. There is no maximum daily waste intake specified in the use permit. However, the Solid Waste Facility Permit (issued by the County Department of Health Services) limits waste to 5,000 tons per day. The waste received at the landfill includes sewage sludge which is currently disposed of in the landfill. The landfill has in the past received waste at its 5,000 tons per day limit, but recently has operated at a much lower rate. Laidlaw reports that in 1994, the facility received an average of approximately 1,720 tons per day.
- 4. Conditional Use Permit 1809-(5) authorized the fill to rise to an elevation of 1,220 feet above sea level.
- 5. The applicant initially proposed to continue operation of the landfill beyond 1997 by expanding the fill capacity by approximately 29.4 million tons of waste. The maximum elevation of fill would increase to 1,430 feet above sea level (210 feet

1

above the current limit). Filling would occur over lined portions of the existing landfill and in adjacent areas to the east and west which have not previously been part of the fill areas. The applicant further proposed that the maximum daily waste intake be increased to 10,000 tons per day. Access would continue to be from the existing entrance on State Route 126, although modifications to the entrance would be made to accommodate the increased waste flow. At 10,000 tons per day, the landfill expansion would have a service life of about 8 years, beginning in 1997. By comparison, at 5,000 tons per day, the expansion would have capacity for 16 years of waste disposal, and at the current level of waste intake, 50 years of capacity.

6. The applicant also requested authorization to conduct composting operations at the landfill. The compost would consist of shredded green waste. Waste water biosolids (e.g., sludge or sludge components) will be prohibited. The conditions of approval for this permit, as granted, provide that a maximum of 560 tons per day may be composted. The composting may be by an open, "windrow system" or an "in-vessel system".

7. The applicant further proposed to establish a materials recovery facility (MRF) and recyclable household hazardous waste facility on a site adjacent to the east side of the landfill. The MRF would handle up to 500 tons per day of source separated material and the recyclable household hazardous waste facility would handle small quantities of household hazardous waste that can be recycled. No commercial hazardous waste would be accepted. These facilities would be accessed via Wolcott Way, an entrance road to the Valencia Commerce Center.

- 8. The bulk of the subject property is zoned A-2-2 and A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture-Two and Five Acre Minimum parcel sizes). The balance of the property, primarily the easterly portion to be occupied by the MRF, is zoned M-1.5 DP (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing-Development Program). The requested uses may be sited within these zones with a Conditional Use Permit. No other zoning entitlements are required.
- 9. Approval of a conditional use permit is dependent (among other things) upon a finding of conformance with the general plan. Other required findings relate to: compatibility of the proposed use with adjacent property; adequacy of the site for

the intended use; and availability of adequate access and utilities. The applicant's written burden of proof relative to these factors, dated July 27, 1995, was received and reviewed by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The factors are further addressed in the environmental impact report for the project which is discussed in more detail, below.

- 10. The Solid Waste Management Plan, contained in the Public Facilities Element of the County General Plan, depicts the Chiquita Canyon Landfill as an existing facility with capacity which will be filled by the year 2000. Such depiction is not, however, a determinant of plan consistency. That plan provides that in considering a waste disposal facility the Board of Supervisors shall be guided by the expertise of agencies such as the County Departments of Public Works and Health Services and the State Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Air Quality Management District. 'The criteria to be applied by the [Regional Planning] Commission in considering an application include the regional and local need for the specific waste disposal facility as well as the potential impacts the use will have on the community. These impacts include but are not limited to noise, odor, visual, circulation/traffic, air and water quality, seismic safety and safety. Regional need should not outweigh the impact on the community.
- 11. The bulk of the subject property is classified "Hillside Management" in the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide General Plan. Hillside Management is a rural designation applicable generally to steeply sloping terrain. A small portion of the property at its northeast corner is classified "Open Space" and another portion in the southeast area of the property is designated "Industry". The "Open Space" classified area was formerly owned by the Federal Government and was assigned the open space designation for that reason. The property has since been exchanged in a land transfer and is in private ownership. Because the property is now privately held, it should be treated as non-urban (rural) under the criteria of the Santa Clarita Area Plan.
- 12. The Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan provides that, subject to restrictions "to minimize environmental disruption and the loss of scenic and open space uses...", waste disposal facilities that require canyon locations as a buffer to urban uses may be sited within non-urban hillside management areas.

The applicable restrictions are as follows:

The proposed use should be located and designed so as not to conflict with established or planned community land use and circulation patterns. Whenever necessary, the proposed land use should be located and designed so as to provide an appropriate land buffer between potentially disruptive, polluting and/or hazardous uses and surrounding lands.

The proposed use shall be located in areas deemed suitable from an ecologic, geologic, and topographic standpoint. The design must minimize the environmental and geologic impacts of the project and preclude ground-water contamination.

Access, egress, and onsite parking should be provided in a manner that maximizes safety and minimizes adverse impacts on surrounding land use patterns. Convenient all weather access will be required for fire fighting purposes.

The design and location of the project should ensure that the transport of toxic, explosive, or otherwise hazardous substances will avoid existing or planned residential communities. Building and site design of any potentially volatile or otherwise hazardous land use should consider as its prime objective the health, safety, and welfare of the community in which it is situated or to which it is proximate.

The proposed site should be appropriately landscaped, fenced, and screened to minimize the visual impact on surrounding and overlooking residences. Particular consideration shall be given to noise, odor, lights, and traffic impacts on neighboring development.

In identified hazard areas, the design of proposed developments should include use of appropriate hazard mitigating or avoidance measures. Such hazards include fire and flooding.

13. The portion of the property classified "Industry" is, generally, the location of the proposed MRF. SR-126 (the main access route to the landfill) is classified as a

4

scenic drive and is proposed for further study as a "First Priority" scenic route. SR-126 is classified as a major highway on the County Highway Plan. Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan policies suggest that SR-126 may be reclassified in the future as an expressway.

- 14. Under the California Integrated Waste Management Act, the County is required to prepare and adopt a <u>Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan</u>, including a siting element providing for at least 15 years of waste disposal capacity. The County Department of Public Works is currently preparing the plan, including assessments of the need for and availability of landfill space. The Department of Public Works projects that even with full realization of waste reduction and recycling goals and maximum expansion/utilization of existing landfills, the County's landfill disposal capacity will eventually decline to the point it will be inadequate to meet the County's daily waste disposal need. The actual time of need for additional capacity will depend upon a number of variables, in particular the final closure dates of certain major landfill facilities in Los Angeles County.
- 15. The County's current landfill policies date to adoption of its <u>Solid Waste</u> <u>Management Action Plan</u> on April 5, 1988, by the Board of Supervisors. Action 7 of the plan provided in part: "Support the revision of all existing permits at the Azusa Western, Chiquita Canyon, North Valley (Sunshine Canyon), Puente Hills and Scholl Canyon Landfills to provide for the maximum, technically and environmentally feasible expansion of these sites...".
- 16. Val Verde, a community predominately of single family homes on small lots, lies to the northwest of the landfill site. To the east is a developing commercial and industrial park, currently containing a Post Office facility and one light industrial occupancy. The land to the immediate north, west and south of the landfill is undeveloped and/or devoted to agricultural use.
- 17. The undeveloped lands to the west, east and south of the landfill are owned by the Newhall Land and Farming Company, which is also the owner of the landfill property.

- 18. A Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was prepared and circulated for agency and public review. Extensive comments on the DEIR were received from both the public and government agencies, including the Departments of Public Works and Health Services, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Air Quality Management District and other State and County agencies having responsibility for permitting of waste disposal and processing facilities.
- 19. Following completion of the written comment period and public hearings on the DEIR, a final environmental impact report was prepared. The final environmental impact report consists of the DEIR and appendices, dated May 1995 and the Final Environmental Impact Report, including responses to comments, dated August 1996, and Part VI to the Final Environmental Impact Report, entitled "Summary and Overview of Board of Supervisors' Project Modifications", dated May 1997 (collectively referred to hereafter as the FEIR). The FEIR contains a detailed description of the project and documents the project's potential impacts and the proposed measures which could be undertaken to mitigate such impacts. The environmental findings, prepared in connection with the FEIR which are contained in the "Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations Regarding The Final Environmental Impact Report, Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion/Closure And Resource Recovery Facilities", which document is on file at the Department of Regional Planning, are incorporated herein by reference, as if set forth in full. A Mitigation Monitoring Program consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the FEIR has been prepared and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for this project. The Board of Supervisors has independently reviewed and considered the FEIR and it reflects the independent judgment of the County as to the potential environmental impacts of the project.
- 20. The FEIR includes analysis for Traffic/Access, Biota, Geotechnical Hazard, Cultural Resources, Flood Hazard/Hydrology, Surface Water and Groundwater Quality, Air Quality, Odor and Other Nuisance, Visual Quality/Landform Alteration, Noise, Sewage Disposal, Utilities, Fire Hazard and Public Health environmental factors. The FEIR concludes that even with available mitigations, significant residual impacts would occur in the areas of air quality and landform alteration. Specifically:

Operational emissions of ozone precursors (NOx and ROC) and PM10 (fine dust) would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds of significance and nuisance odors may potentially result from composting;

Construction emissions of NOx would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds of significance during construction periods;

There would be a permanent change in landform due to the landfill and recycling facility development.

Accordingly, in compliance with State CEQA Guideline Section 15093, the Board of Supervisors has adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project. The Statement of Overriding Considerations, as contained in the "Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations Regarding The Final Environmental Impact Report, Chiquita Canyon Landfill Expansion/Closure And Resource Recovery Facilities" is incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full. As stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board finds that the remaining impacts on air quality and landform alteration have been reduced to the extent feasible and that the benefits of the project outweigh these unavoidable adverse impacts. Such unavoidable adverse impacts are determined to be acceptable based upon the overriding considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

- 21. Conditions necessary to implement the mitigation measures and programs identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the FEIR have been imposed as conditions of the grant of this conditional use permit.
- 22. After assessing the available alternatives as discussed in the FEIR and described at the public hearing and after considering the version of the project approved by the Regional Planning Commission, the Board finds that it should grant authorization for a maximum waste disposal rate of 5,000 tons per day average and for an additional seven (7) years to the life of the new permit and five (5) million tons of capacity beyond the version approved by the Commission

(for a total life of 22 years and a maximum capacity of 23 million tons). Such additional life and tonnage is justified not only by additional significant mitigation measures and the funding of a Val Verde Community Benefits Fund set forth in an agreement between the applicant and the Val Verde Civic Association, all of which have been incorporated into the conditions of grant for the landfill expansion, but also by the County's need for additional solid waste disposal capacity in order to meet the requirements of AB 939 to provide for at least 15 years of waste disposal capacity. In that regard, the Board notes that at the maximum 5,000 ton per day rate of fill, the 18.2 million ton capacity recommended by the Commission would have a life of 10 years whereas the 23 million ton capacity authorized by the Board would have a life of almost 15 years at the maximum 5,000 ton per day rate. Additional capacity may be approved in the future, if the demand for in-County fill capacity continues as now projected.

- 23. Based upon the FEIR, with reasonable care and due diligence in the regulation and operation of the landfill, hazard to the neighboring community and public services will not occur. Approval of the landfill expansion in increments will serve to assure that the landfill will be operated in compliance with the conditions of grant and that any warranted changes in conditions can be made, if necessary, in connection with future applications for expansion.
- 24. The Board finds that the proposed MRF should be authorized for a 30 year term of grant. The proposed site of this facility is within a developing business park and the nature of operation and its planned appearance is such that it will be fully compatible with other contemplated uses. The facility also has the potential to provide a necessary service in assisting to achieve waste diversion and recycling goals. A fixed term of grant is, however, appropriate to enable adjustments in the grant which may become necessary due to future changes in circumstances.
- 25. The Board, like the Planning Commission, does not find it appropriate to require that the MRF be constructed and operated as a condition of entitlement to expand the landfill. However, the applicant's offer of such a facility was a significant factor in the Board's decision to authorize the continued operation of the landfill. The Board therefore expects the applicant-permittee to exercise good faith and due diligence in working to establish the facility. In that regard,

the Board has required in the conditions of approval for this project that the permittee perform an economic viability and marketing study on an annual basis to assess opportunities to implement the MRF in an expeditious manner.

- 26. The applicant's submitted plans, copies of which are on file, verify that there is adequate area at the landfill and materials recovery site for necessary ancillary facilities, including recycling areas and employee parking.
- The traffic, access and utility services for the project are addressed in detail in 27. the FEIR and attached environmental findings. The proposed MRF site, which as noted in Finding 13, above, is classified "Industry" on the Santa Clarita General Plan, is also designated "urban expansion" on the Development Policy Map of the County General Plan. As such, development of the site with an urban use is subject to a finding of conformance with Development Monitoring System (DMS) criteria. Development of the MRF site and adjacent area were previously found to be in conformance with DMS criteria in connection with approval of the Valencia Commerce Center in Conditional Use Permit 87-360-(5), the findings for which are on file at the Department of Regional Planning and are incorporated herein by reference. An urban services analysis and environmental assessment specific to the proposed MRF were included in the project FEIR for Conditional Use Permit 89-081-(5). Findings with respect to the economic, social and environmental DMS factors for the MRF are contained in the environmental findings referenced in finding number 19, above. The conditions of grant for the MRF will require that the MRF development comply with all infrastructure and design specifications of Conditional Use Permit 87-360-(5).
- 28. A portion of the burden of proof for a conditional use permit is that "... the requested use at the location proposed will not ... be materially detrimental to the ... valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site". Opponents of the landfill have maintained that extension of the landfill as proposed would significantly diminish the value of property within adjacent residential areas. Studies on this subject have been commissioned by the applicant and presented to the Board of Supervisors. The Board determines that the preponderance of evidence does not support a finding that the project, as approved, would be materially detrimental.

- The Board determines that it is important to the County's adopted Solid Waste 29. Management Action Plan and the County's proposed Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, and to the ability of the County to meet the requirements of AB 939 by providing for at least 15 years of waste disposal capacity, that the Chiquita Canyon facility be continued as provided in this Conditional Use Permit 89-081-(5). Therefore, in the conditions of approval for the landfill expansion, the Board of Supervisors has provided that, in the event the operator is precluded from utilizing Conditional Use Permit 89-081-(5) as a result of a lawsuit, the operator may continue to operate the existing landfill under existing Conditional Use Permit 1809-(5) beyond the November 24, 1997 expiration date applicable thereto, subject to all other conditions and limitations set forth in Conditional Use Permit 1809-(5), until completion of the latestapproved fill design on file for Conditional Use Permit 1809-(5), or November 24, 2000, or until such lawsuit is resolved allowing the operator to continue the landfill under Conditional Use Permit 89-081-(5), whichever occurs first.
- 30. The Board of Supervisors has heard and considered the input of the Regional Planning Commission, staff, other local and state agencies and members of the public with respect to the best means of implementing the various objectives of the General Plan at the subject property.

# BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONCLUDES:

- A. The use as modified and conditioned is consistent with the adopted general plan.
- B. As modified and with the attached restrictions and conditions, the requested use will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area and will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site and will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.
- C. The site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance and otherwise required to

integrate the use requested with the uses in the surrounding area.

D. The site has adequate traffic access and is adequately served by other public or private facilities which it requires.

THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS approves the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the project and certifies that it has reviewed and considered the information contained therein; certifies that the Final Environmental Impact Report has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State and County Guidelines relating thereto and reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Supervisors as to the environmental consequences of the project; determines that the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final Environmental Impact Report and the conditions of project approval are the only mitigation measures for the project which are feasible; determines that the remaining unavoidable environmental effects of the project have been reduced to the extent possible and to an acceptable level and are outweighed by specific social, economic and environmental benefits of the project; adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations prepared for the project; adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project; and, approves this conditional use permit, subject to the attached conditions. 15. .

A:\CUP89081.FIN 4/30/97
#### CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NUMBER 89-081(5)

- 1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.
- 2. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee and the owner of the property involved (if other than the permittee) have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning their affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant.
- 3. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or other applicable time period. The County shall promptly notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the permittee shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the County.

In the event that any claim, action or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay the Department of Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which the actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expense involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including, but not limited to, depositions, testimony and other assistance to the permittee or the permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deposited.

a. If during the litigation process the actual costs incurred decrease the account to less than \$1,000, an amount necessary to restore the balance to \$5,000. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that

1

may be required before completion of the litigation.

b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The costs for collection and duplication of records shall be paid by the permittee according to the provisions of Section 2.170.010 of the County Code.

- 4. Attached to these conditions is a Monitoring Program which is incorporated into these conditions by reference. The permittee shall fully perform each action required of the permittee by the monitoring program as if it were specifically set forth in these conditions.
- 5. This grant, as it applies to the approved landfill expansion described in Condition 9, will terminate upon the completion of the approved fill design, as shown on Exhibit "A," or on November 24, 2019, whichever occurs first. Should this grant as it applies to the landfill expansion terminate without new or additional permits having been granted, no further waste shall be accepted for disposal. However, the permittee is authorized to continue such facilities in operation as are necessary to complete mitigation measures required by this grant, for closure or post-closure maintenance required by federal, state and local agencies, or for operation of the materials recovery facility described in Condition 10, the recyclable household hazardous waste facility described in Condition 11 and the composting facility described in Condition 12. All facilities not required for mitigation, closure or post-closure maintenance or such recycling facilities shall be removed unless they are of a type permitted as a matter of course by the zoning regulations then in effect.

This grant as it applies to the materials recovery facility described in Condition 10, the recyclable household hazardous waste facility described in Condition 11 and the composting facilities described in Condition 12 shall terminate on November 24, 2027. Use of the property thereafter shall be in accord with the regulations then in effect.

If any provision of this grant that is challenged by the permittee is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted

6.

2

#### hereunder shall lapse.

7. The subject property shall be developed, maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property, including but not limited to those permits, if any, issued by the following agencies:

- a. The Local Enforcement Agency and the California Integrated Waste Management Board;
- b. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region;
- c. The South Coast Air Quality Management District;
- d. The California Department of Fish and Game;
- e. The California Environmental Protection Agency;
- f. The California Department of Transportation;
- g. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

- 8. Notice is hereby given that any person intentionally violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or a hearing officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant if the Commission or hearing officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.
- 9. This grant allows the establishment and operation of a Class III landfill, together with certain ancillary and related activities as enumerated herein, subject to the

following restrictions as to use:

- a. Liquid or hazardous waste or radioactive waste/material shall not be accepted. Should such prohibited waste be nevertheless received at the landfill, it shall be handled and disposed of as provided in Condition 26. The term "liquid waste" as used herein includes non-hazardous sludges meeting the requirements contained in Title 23, Chapter 15 of the California Code of Regulations for disposal in a Class III landfill. The landfill shall not accept sludge or sludge components at any time.
- b. No portion of the expanded landfill may extend above the plane or outside of the surface area of the fill design as shown on the approved site plan, attached as Exhibit A.

As used in this Condition 9b "landfill" refers to the portion of the subject property in which waste is to be permanently placed and then buried under daily and interim cover material but excludes adjacent cut slopes, temporary storage areas, and any materials recovery facility, composting facility, recyclable household hazardous waste facility, and ancillary facilities authorized by this grant. Allowance for settlement of fill shall not be made in determining compliance with this Condition 9b.

The existing viewshed from Chiquito Canyon Road as presented pictorially to the Board of Supervisors on 2/25/97 shall be protected for the life of the project. The dip in the natural ridgeline along the western boundary shall be maintained or enhanced. Any structure placed on the landfill site, including but not limited to temporary storage areas, any materials recovery facility, composting facility or any other ancillary facilities that may be visible from Chiquito Canyon Road shall be designed to be harmonious with the natural topography and viewshed and shall be reviewed by the Community Advisory Committee.

The landfill operator and the Community Advisory Committee shall work together to prepare a tree planting and maintenance plan for the entire western boundary of the site. The objectives of the plan are to screen landfill operations, enhance the viewshed, establish the minimum number

<u>ATTACHMENT C</u> PAGE 18 OF 53 and type of trees to do this and to provide adequate access to monitoring wells. Trees may be planted on slopes on either side of the ridgeline provided the above objectives are met and such planting is practical.

- c. Nothing in Condition 9b or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the landfill or to otherwise modify the conditions of this grant.
- d. The net tonnage placed in the landfill shall not exceed 30,000 tons per week (5,000 tons per day average based upon 6 working days per week).
- e. The net tonnage of waste placed in the landfill on any given day shall not exceed 6,000 tons.
- f. Net tonnage shall not include:
  - Clean dirt or other approved materials used for daily cover, to cover and prepare interim and final fill slopes, or for other construction purposes; and
    - Waste processed and put to a beneficial use on the landfill or separated or otherwise diverted from the waste stream and exported from the landfill for the purpose of recycling or reuse, in accord with the restrictions of Condition 9j and the agreement entered into pursuant to Part II of the attached monitoring program, and including waste handled through any materials recovery facility, household hazardous waste facility or composting facility within the restrictions set forth in Conditions 10, 11, and 12.
- g. The Board of Supervisors may increase the net tonnage allowed by Conditions 9d and 9e to 49,000 tons per week and 7,700 tons maximum per day if the Board of Supervisors, upon the joint recommendation of the Local Enforcement Agency and the Director of Public Works, determines that an increase is necessary to appropriately manage the overall County waste stream for the protection of the public health and safety. Not more than 355 days of overages may be given over the life of this grant.

Nothing in this condition shall permit the maximum landfill capacity of 23 million tons to be increased.

- h. Operating hours may be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, except that, other than as provided in Condition 20i, the landfill shall not accept refuse for disposal from 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays through 4:00 a.m. on Mondays. Maintenance activities may occur during these times.
- i. The permittee shall operate the landfill in a manner which maximizes the amount of waste which can be placed within the available approved volume, including but not limited to the following:
  - Investigate and implement, as appropriate, methods of diverting or reducing high volume-low density materials which are not capable of being readily compacted;
  - Investigate and implement, as permitted by the appropriate regulatory agencies, methods to reduce the volume of daily cover required; and
  - Utilize waste materials received and processed at the landfill, such as shredded green waste, as a supplement to daily, intermediate and final cover, to the extent deemed technically feasible and acceptable by regulatory agencies.
- j. Notwithstanding any other provision of this grant, the permittee shall not knowingly impede or prevent the attainment of waste diversion objectives of City and County Source Reduction and Recycling Elements and the County Integrated Waste Management Plan adopted pursuant to Division 30 of the Public Resources Code.
- k. Business signs are allowed as permitted in Zone C-1.
- Nothing in this Condition 9 or elsewhere in these conditions of grant shall be construed to require the permittee to engage in any act which is in violation of any state or federal regulation.

- m. The County reserves the right to exercise its police power to protect the public health, safety and general welfare by managing the county-wide waste stream, including such activities as the setting of appropriate taxes or fees.
- n. The daily waste limits specified in this Condition 9 may be varied with the approval of the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) to respond to a declared emergency.
- 10. This grant allows the establishment and operation of a materials recovery facility, subject to the following restrictions as to use:
  - a. The facility shall be no larger than 60,000 square feet in size, and shall be designed to accommodate no more than 500 tons per day of materials.
  - b. Nothing in this Condition 10 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the materials recovery facility or to otherwise modify the conditions of this grant.
  - c. Nothing in this Condition 10 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to require the permittee to engage in any act which is in violation of any state or federal regulation.
  - d. Operating hours may be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, for purposes of processing materials, operating equipment, and/or maintaining the facility.
  - e. The delivery of material to the materials recovery facility by all but commercial and municipal entities shall not occur outside the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., 7 days per week.
  - f. Vehicles removing recyclable materials from the materials recovery facility may access the facility 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.
  - g. Site development shall substantially conform to Exhibit "A", any

requirements of Conditional Use permit 87-360 (on file at the Department of Regional Planning) not in conflict with the provisions of this grant, and the mitigations listed in the visual impact section of the environmental impact report for this Conditional Use Permit 89-081-(5).

- 11. This grant allows the establishment and operation of a recyclable household hazardous waste facility, subject to the following restrictions as to use:
  - a. The facility may be used by the general public to drop off recyclable household hazardous wastes, including, but not limited to, used motor oil, used latex paints, used anti-freeze, and used batteries. The facility is not to be used for general use by commercial or industrial entities.
  - b. The facility shall be no larger than 2,100 square feet in size, exclusive of ingress and egress.
  - c. Nothing in this Condition 11 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the recyclable household hazardous waste facility or to otherwise modify the conditions of grant.
  - d. Recyclable materials shall not be collected in quantities or stored for periods which would cause the need for a hazardous waste facilities permit unless such permit has already been obtained.
  - e. Nothing in this Condition 11 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to require the permittee to engage in any act which is in violation of any state or federal regulation.
  - f. Operating hours may be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, for purposes of processing materials, operating equipment, and/or maintaining the facility.
  - g. The delivery of material to the recyclable household hazardous waste facility by members of the general public shall not occur outside the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., 7 days per week.

- h. The facility shall be staffed continuously during operating hours by an individual trained in hazardous materials management.
- i. Site development shall substantially conform to Exhibit "A", any requirements of Conditional Use Permit 87-360 not in conflict with the provisions of this grant, and the mitigations listed in the visual impact section of the mitigation monitoring summary reference in the mitigation monitoring program for this Conditional Use Permit 89-081-(5).
- 12. This grant allows the establishment and operation of a composting facility, using either windrow or in-vessel technology, together with certain ancillary and related activities as enumerated herein, subject to the following restrictions as to use:
  - a. The facility may be used to receive, process and compost green waste and to store and distribute finished mulch, biomass fuel and compost.
  - b. The facility shall consist of a receiving and processing area no more than 4 acres in size, a composting area no more than 30 acres in size, and a storage and distribution area no more than 7 acres in size.
  - c. Nothing in this Condition 12 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to prohibit the permittee from applying for new permits to expand the composting facility or to otherwise modify the conditions of grant.
  - d. The composting operation shall receive no more than 560 tons per day of green waste and no wastewater biosolids (e.g., sludge or sludge components).
  - e. Nothing in this Condition 12 or elsewhere in these conditions shall be construed to require the permittee to engage in any act which is in violation of any state or federal regulation.

Operating hours may be 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

f

- g. Access by customers for purposes of removing finished mulch, biomass fuel and compost shall not occur outside the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., 7 days per week.
- All windrow areas shall be located on existing compacted landfill areas meeting all requirements of regulatory agencies for such use.
- i. The permittee shall comply with all rules for odor abatement and prevention of the South Coast Air Quality Management District and the County Department of Health Services (LEA). The permittee shall not allow odors to become a nuisance in adjacent residential areas. In the event odors become a nuisance in adjacent residential areas, permittee shall take all necessary steps to abate that nuisance. If the permittee, despite the application of the best available technology and methodology, cannot abate nuisance odors resulting from composting, the permittee shall terminate such operations.
- 13. The subject property may be used for the following ancillary facilities or activities:
  - Offices, employee facilities, and truck and equipment storage and maintenance facilities related directly to the landfill, the materials recovery facility, the composting facility, the recyclable household hazardous waste facility and/or other waste handling and processing operations allowed under this grant, but excluding offices and other facilities related to any unrelated enterprises operated by the permittee or others;
    - Leachate collection and processing facilities;
  - Facilities necessary for the collection, disposal, utilization and distribution of landfill gases as required and/or approved by the South Coast Air Quality Management District; and
    - Facilities necessary for fire protection and similar purposes.

- 14. If the landfill regularly meets its weekly and/or daily maximum limit, as set forth in Condition 9d and 9e, the permittee shall implement a program to avert wasted trips to the landfill and illegal disposal, which program shall include:
  - a. Scheduling of regular users, such as commercial and municipal haulers, to prevent them from arriving at the landfill and being diverted to other landfills; and
  - b. Reservation of capacity for small commercial and private users, unless an alternate landfill located within 15 miles of the permittee's landfill is available to accept such users.
- 15. The permittee shall implement programs if necessary to discourage trucking of partially filled loads to the landfill by commercial and municipal haulers. The permittee shall also take such measures as are necessary to prevent queuing of trucks waiting to enter the landfill on State Route 126.
- 16. The permittee shall install and/or pay for traffic improvements as set forth below, to the extent deemed warranted by the County's Department of Public Works and the California Department of Transportation. As used in this condition, "warranted" means justified on the basis of established standards of the County, the California Department of Transportation and/or by accepted traffic engineering practice. Improvements may include, as determined by the County and the California Department of Transportation:
  - a. Installation of advance entrance signs on State Route 126 on both sides of the landfill entrance notifying motorists of the approaching entrance and of the exclusive left-turn and right-turn lanes for landfill traffic;
  - b. Installation of a second incoming truck scale at the landfill entrance before acceptance of waste in the landfill expansion area or as otherwise directed by the Local Enforcement Agency. In the event the permittee or the Local Enforcement Agency determines that an additional truck scale is necessary before acceptance of waste in the expansion area, the permittee shall install a temporary truck scale as soon as reasonably feasible. Any such temporary scale shall be replaced by a permanent

truck scale upon completion of any necessary permitting and construction;

c. Coordination with the California Department of Transportation on its State Route 126 widening project to provide for a left-turn and acceleration/deceleration lane in the center of State Route 126 near the landfill entrance;

- d. Installation of a traffic control signal at the entrance of the landfill as may be required based on a warrant analysis approved by the California Department of Transportation;
- e. As required to serve the materials recovery facility, improve Wolcott Way from State Route 126 to the materials recovery facility site and the site frontage to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works; and
- f. Permittee's financial contribution toward the installation of a traffic control signal at the intersection of State Route 126 and Interstate 5, as may be required by a warrant analysis approved by the California Department of Transportation. Permittee's contribution shall be based on permittee's facilities' traffic impacts as a percentage of total traffic at this intersection.
- 17. Except as otherwise provided in this condition, the final landfill surface shall be concurrently reclaimed and revegetated as described in the Revegetation and Erosion Control Program (Oasis Associates, Inc. March, 1995) developed for the landfill expansion.

If the Local Enforcement Agency determines either (1) that a different design or plan would better protect the public health and safety and would enable revegetation of the final landfill surface as well as or better than the Revegetation and Erosion Control Program, and/or (2) that a change is dictated by revisions to the minimum standards adopted by the California Integrated Waste Management Board, and as a result the Local Enforcement Agency directs the implementation of a different design and/or plan, then the permittee shall not be bound by the provisions of this condition.

<u>ATTACHMENT C</u> PAGE 26 OF 53 18. A temporary vegetation cover shall be established on all slopes and other areas that are to remain inactive for a period longer than 180 days.

The permittee shall employ expert assistance to carry out this condition. Soil sampling and laboratory analysis shall be conducted before revegetation to identify chemical or physical soil properties that may adversely affect plant growth and establishment. Soil amendments and fertilizer recommendations shall be applied and plant materials selected as indicated by the tests. To the extent possible, plant types shall blend with species indigenous to the area and be drought tolerant and shall be capable of rapid establishment. For specific requirements, see the Revegetation and Erosion Control Program (Oasis Associates, Inc., March 1995).

- 19. The permittee shall utilize the most effective available technology and methodology to avert fugitive dust emissions which may be a nuisance or hazard in adjacent populated locations or which may cause significant damage to wildland resources. In addition to the revegetation measures required in Conditions 17 and 18 and listed in the mitigation monitoring summary, the permittee shall comply with the regulations approved by the Local Enforcement Agency and the rules for dust abatement and prevention of the South Coast Air Quality Management District.
- 20. The permittee shall employ the most effective available technology and methodology to prevent litter which enters the area under the permittee's control in the form of waste from escaping the area. The permittee's on-site litter control program shall include, unless otherwise provided by the Local Enforcement Agency, the following:
  - a. Landfill personnel shall regularly patrol the access road from the scales to the working face from the time it opens to the time it closes in the evening;
  - Improperly covered or contained loads which may result in a significant release of litter shall be immediately stopped and the condition corrected, if practicable, before the load proceeds to the working face. If correction cannot be made, the load shall be transported under escort to the working

face.

- c. All debris found on or along the entrance and working face access roads shall be immediately removed;
- d. Operating areas shall be located in wind shielded portions of the landfill during windy periods;
- e. The landfill operator shall install and maintain temporary litter fences in operating areas and in those areas along the property perimeter that are regularly littered due to the location of the operating area, time of year, and climatic conditions. The landfill operator and the Community Advisory Committee shall work together to identify littered areas in need of fencing.
- f. The permittee shall require open-bed trucks exiting the landfill either to be swept clean of loose debris or to be covered so as to minimize the possibility of litter escaping onto State Route 126.
- g. The landfill operator shall install speed bumps on landfill property in paved areas along the route of trucks leaving the landfill. The purpose of the speed bumps is to knock out dirt and debris accumulated in wheel wells before trucks leave the site.
- h. Landfill personnel shall police Chiquito Canyon Road from SR 126 to the entrance to Val Verde at Rancho Avilos and the surrounding area within 100 feet of the centerline of the road or to any existing fence on private property for the purpose of locating and cleaning up litter in this area. Litter pickup shall be a minimum of one time per month and may be increased, upon agreement between the landfill operator and the Community Advisory Committee, to maintain a litter free environment.
- i. The landfill operator shall provide four free quarterly clean-up days to residents of Val Verde, showing proper identification and proof of residence at the landfill entrance. These days may be Sundays. The operator shall further reimburse the Community Advisory Committee for

the cost of providing two rolloff bins in Val Verde on each clean-up day. The operator and Committee may jointly change this program if they mutually determine alternatives to the above can further assist the community.

21. The permittee shall, to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and the Local Enforcement Agency, maintain programs aimed at controlling the discharge and recovery of litter from uncovered or improperly covered or contained loads traveling to the landfill.

The measures shall include an effective tarping program, which if necessary in the estimation of the Director of Public Works and the Local Enforcement Agency, shall provide for mandatory sale of tarps to violators and/or punitive fees and exclusion from the landfill of repeated violators.

- 22. The permittee shall post a sign at the entry gate at State Route 126 which indicates the following:
  - a. The telephone number by which persons may on a 24-hour basis contact the permittee to register complaints and/or comments regarding landfill operations;
  - b. The telephone number of the Local Enforcement Agency and the hours when the number is manned; and
  - c. The telephone number of the enforcement offices of the South Coast Air Quality Management District and the hours when the number is manned.
- 23. The permittee shall at all times during operating hours maintain adequate staff to promptly respond to litter and other complaints from the surrounding neighborhood. The permittee shall have bilingual (Spanish/English) employees available during business hours. The permittee shall arrange to have Spanish speaking operators available for messages 24 hours per day.
- 24. Except as otherwise provided in this condition, areas outside of and above the cut and fill shown on Exhibit A (including borrow areas) shall not be graded or

similarly disturbed to create the landfill areas approved in Condition 9b or new soil stockpile areas or disturbed areas for construction staging not shown on Exhibit A. The Director of Public Works may approve additional grading if the Director determines, based upon engineering studies provided by the permittee and independently evaluated by the Director, that such additional grading or disturbance is necessary for slope stability or drainage purposes or for soil stockpiling or construction staging. Such a determination shall be documented as provided in Part I of the attached monitoring program.

In the case of soil stockpiling and staging areas not shown on Exhibit "A" or located within the approved fill area, the permittee shall submit a letter from a qualified biologist certifying that the affected area is not a location of biological sensitivity as identified in the project environmental impact report. No approval shall be granted under this condition which will result in expanding the area or height of fill or in lowering or significantly modifying any of the ridgelines surrounding the landfill.

Nothing in this condition shall be construed as prohibiting the installation of water tanks, access roads, flares, or similar facilities or mitigation programs required by this grant or by permits issued by other public agencies.

- 25. The permittee shall implement a program to identify and conserve any significant archaeological or paleontological materials which may be present in accord with this condition. If any evidence of such materials is discovered during earth moving activities, landfill operations shall cease in that immediate area and said area shall be preserved until a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist has made a determination as to the significance of the site or findings. Any significant archaeological or paleontological resources shall be recovered, to the extent practicable, before resuming activities in that area of the landfill.
- 26. The permittee shall implement a comprehensive waste load checking program designed to exclude disposal of liquid and hazardous wastes and radioactive material at the landfill, which program shall comply with the requirements of this condition and Part III of the attached monitoring program and any additional requirements of the Local Enforcement Agency, the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the California

Integrated Waste Management Board.

**5**,

Restrictions on disposal of radioactive material and hazardous and liquid wastes and the procedures for proper disposal at other appropriately classified disposal sites or waste processing facilities shall be provided to waste haulers on a routine basis. Notices shall also be posted at prominent locations at the landfill to inform waste haulers of the rules governing the disposal of liquid and hazardous waste, and radioactive material.

In the event that material known or suspected to be hazardous waste or radioactive material is discovered at the landfill, the permittee's agent shall:

- a. If the vehicle that delivered the waste is still present, attempt to identify the driver and obtain his driver's license number and vehicle's license number;
- Immediately make all required notifications to State and County agencies; and
- c. If possession of the material is not immediately taken by a public official, store the material at a site developed in accord with the regulations of the California Environmental Protection Agency and the Regional Water Quality Control Board until disposed of in accord with applicable State and Federal Regulations.

The permittee shall also provide effective vector control measures as directed by the County Department of Health Services.

Nothing in this condition shall be construed to permit the maintenance of a hazardous waste disposal facility at the landfill.

27. The permittee shall contact the Department of Public Works to determine whether an Industrial Waste Disposal Permit is required. No activity for which a permit is required shall be initiated on the subject property before a permit is obtained and any required facilities are installed. The permittee shall keep any required permits in full force and effect and shall fully comply with any requirements thereof.

28. The permittee shall install drainage structures and comply with all other drainage requirements of the Department of Public Works and any additional requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and any other regulatory agency with appropriate jurisdiction. Except as specifically otherwise provided by the Department of Public Works, all drainage structures, including sedimentation basins, shall be designed and constructed so as to accommodate run-off from a capital storm.

The landfill and drainage structures shall in all cases be designed so as to cause surface water to be diverted away from disposal areas.

The permittee shall further comply with all grading requirements of the Department of Public Works and County Ordinance.

- 29. The permittee shall install and maintain containment (liner) systems and leachate collection and removal systems as approved and required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 30. The permittee shall install and test ground water monitoring wells as required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and shall promptly undertake any action directed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to correct or prevent contamination which may affect ground water quality or water conveyance or storage facilities. Any testing or remedial actions deemed necessary by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to correct or prevent contamination or to determine the existence of any contamination from the existing landfill operated by the permittee which, in the opinion of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, should be completed or guaranteed before commencement of landfill expansion shall be completed or guaranteed by the permittee before commencement of the expansion to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 31. The permittee shall maintain on-site fire response capabilities, construct access roads, provide water tanks, water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows and perform brush clearance to the satisfaction of the County Forester and Fire Warden.

- 32. All on-site fuel storage tanks shall be installed and necessary containment and air quality controls provided in accord with the requirements of the County Forester and Fire Warden, the County Department of Public Works, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District.
- 33. The permittee shall take all necessary measures to ensure that noise emissions from the on-site facilities at any residential receptor are within the limits of the County Noise Ordinance, as contained in Title 12 of the County Code.
- Unless otherwise authorized by the South Coast Air Quality Management 34. District, the permittee shall install and maintain a best available control technology landfill gas collection system in compliance with the requirements of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The permittee shall also control the lateral migration of gases to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works, the Local Enforcement Agency, the California Integrated Waste Management Board and the South Coast Air Quality Management District, as applicable. The permittee shall use his best efforts to maximize landfill gas collection consistent with applicable government regulations. The permittee shall use the best available technology when installing and maintaining landfill gas collection systems. Permittee shall purchase a maximum of five combustible gas monitors, at least one of which is able to be used outdoors, an organic vapor analyzer, similar to the monitors used in structures at the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, and provide same to the Community Advisory Committee for placement in locations of concern to the community, as determined by the Committee. These monitors are designed to detect and provide warning in the event of a build-up of methane gas. The Committee shall be responsible for locating, monitoring and maintaining such monitors. In the event such monitors indicate discernible levels of methane gas, the Committee and the landfill operator shall jointly investigate the situation and if it is determined that the landfill is the cause of such methane gas build-up, the landfill operator will take corrective action. The permittee shall work with the Citizens Advisory Committee in understanding the requirements of Rule 1150.1 governing the control of gaseous emissions from active landfills. The permittee shall forward copies of any notices or reports filed with or received from the regulatory agency or agencies responsible for oversight.

- 35. Landfill gas flares shall be below the adjacent ridges and the flames shall be totally contained within the stack, unless otherwise required by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Flame arresters shall be provided to the satisfaction of the County Forester and Fire Warden.
- 36. The permittee shall adopt and implement operational practices to mitigate vehicular and other air quality impacts as required by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.
- 37. The permittee shall operate the on-site facilities in a manner which conserves water, including but not limited to the following:
  - The permittee shall investigate the feasibility of treating collected leachate on-site for reuse in the landfill and shall, if feasible and approved by the appropriate agencies, implement a program to utilize such water;
  - b. Soil sealant, pavement and other control measures shall be used wherever possible in preference to water for dust control; and
  - c. Drought-tolerant plants shall be used to the extent possible to revegetate.
- 38. The permittee shall comply with any applicable provisions of Sections 1601-1603 of the California Fish and Game Code and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act before alteration of drainage courses and shall mitigate any disturbed wetland habitat or jurisdictional habitat to the satisfaction of the California Department of Fish and Game and/or the United States Army Corps of Engineers, as applicable.
- 39. To the extent permitted by law, the Local Enforcement Agency shall have the authority to order the immediate cessation of landfilling or other activities at the site if it determines that the health, safety and/or welfare of the inhabitants of the County of Los Angeles so requires. Such cessation shall continue until such time as the Local Enforcement Agency determines that the conditions leading to the cessation have been eliminated or reduced to a level which no longer poses an unacceptable threat to such health, safety and/or welfare.

<u>ATTACHMENT C</u> PAGE 34 OF 5<u>3</u>

- 40. In order to undertake and administer planning studies for unincorporated communities in the vicinity of the landfill, the permittee shall pay to the Department of Regional Planning \$75,000 on July 1, 1998, \$75,000 on July 1, 1999, and \$100,000 on July 1, 2000. In order to provide funding for community planning needs as identified by such planning studies, the permittee shall pay to the Department of Regional Planning \$30,000 per annum commencing July 1, 2001 and continuing each July 1 for the life of this grant applicable to the landfill. The funds received shall be placed in an interest bearing trust account until used for the specified purposes.
- 41. The permittee shall pay to the County of Los Angeles a fee equal to ten percent (10%) of the sum of the following:
  - The net tipping fees collected at the landfill (excluding any tipping fees received for waste processed at the materials recovery, recyclable household hazardous waste and composting facilities approved in Conditions 10, 11 and 12), the net tipping fee being the total collected less any other fees or taxes imposed by any federal, state or local agency and included in the fee charged at the landfill entrance;
    - Gas to energy or direct gas sale revenues, less any federal, state or local fees or taxes included in such revenues.

Should the County impose a business tax on landfill revenues, the amount received from the permittee shall be credited against the fees required by this Condition 41.

- 42. As agreed, the permittee shall make a good faith effort to establish and maintain, based on, among other things, economic viability, the materials recovery and recyclable household hazardous waste facilities approved in Conditions 10 and 11. The permittee shall perform an economic viability and marketing study on an annual basis to assess opportunities to implement a materials recovery facility in an expeditious manner. Nothing in this condition shall mandate the permittee to implement a materials recovery facility.
- 43. The permittee shall present its Emergency Response Plan to the Community

Advisory Committee and develop an additional component with the Committee for emergency notification to the Val Verde community. The landfill operator shall bear the reasonable costs, if any, of plan implementation.

- 44. Permittee shall comply with the Statement of Agreements and Understandings it entered into with certain community representatives on February 21 and 24, 1997, as that agreement has been amended and as it may be amended according to its terms. County enforcement of this condition shall be limited to a revocation or modification proceeding under County Code Section 22.56.1780 et seq., which may be commenced only in the event that a court or other decision maker of competent jurisdiction determines that the Permittee has breached its obligations under the Statement of Agreements and Understandings.
- 45. The permittee shall purchase translation equipment as specified by the Val Verde Civic Association for a one time cost not to exceed \$8,000, by or before the first Val Verde Community Benefits Fund payment is made in accordance with the Statement of Agreements and Understandings referenced in condition no. 44, above.
- 46. The maximum total capacity of the landfill shall be 23 million tons. Landfill closure shall occur when this capacity is reached or by November 24, 2019, whichever occurs first.
- 47. In the event that the permittee is precluded from utilizing this grant as a result of a lawsuit, the permittee may continue to operate the existing landfill under CUP 1809-(5) beyond the November 24, 1997 expiration date applicable thereto, subject to all other conditions and limitations set forth in CUP 1809-(5), until completion of the fill design shown on the latest approved Exhibit A on file with CUP 1809-(5), or November 24, 2000, or resolution of the lawsuit challenging the grant of this CUP 89 081-(5), whichever occurs first.

A:\CUP89081.CON 4/29/97

22

# Summary of Comments

 Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission have expressed concern about the County's approval of a limited operational waiver for the landfill pursuant to County Code Section 22.04.110. The waiver became effective in June 2016, when the landfill reached the disposal capacity of 23 million tons in the current conditional use permit. The County prepared a Topical Response to these comments, which is included in the Final EIR.<sup>1</sup>

# Applicant Rebuttal

- The current conditional use permit includes several limits on landfill capacity:
  - Daily and weekly tonnage limits
  - Sunset date of November 24, 2019
  - Physical limits of the approved Exhibit A site plan
  - 23 million tons of disposal capacity
- The environmental review process for the proposed landfill expansion has taken longer than expected. The County and Chiquita Canyon Landfill decided to take a cautious approach and recirculate a number of chapters of the Draft EIR.
- Anticipating that the landfill would reach the 23-million-ton disposal capacity before the County could complete the environmental review process and approve a new conditional use permit, Chiquita Canyon Landfill requested a waiver pursuant to Section 22.04.110 of the County Code, to allow the continued processing of the environmental analysis and conditional use permit for the landfill expansion.
- Because the landfill has compacted waste effectively and efficiently, the overall 23-million-ton disposal capacity could be exceeded without exceeding any of the other capacity restrictions on the landfill, including the physical limits of the approved Exhibit A site plan.
- The EIR certified by the Board of Supervisors in 1997 analyzed an overall disposal capacity of 29.4 million tons. An addendum to the certified EIR was prepared to analyze the waiver request.
- Chiquita Canyon Landfill receives waste from the Santa Clarita Valley and the rest of Los Angeles County. Closure of the landfill would result in environmental impacts, including traffic impacts in the local area due to re-routing of disposal trucks and a likely lack of adequate disposal alternatives available to Valley and other County residents.
- The Director approved the waiver, on a short-term basis, to give the County time to complete the thorough and comprehensive environmental review of the new permit request and to prevent a disruption in the County's solid waste disposal system.
- The waiver expires on July 31, 2017 and requires strict adherence to conditions of approval, including:
  - Compliance with all conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permit No. 98-081, except for the 23-million-ton disposal capacity
  - The physical envelope of the approved Exhibit A site plan cannot be exceeded

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL APPLICANT REBUTTAL COUNTY CODE SECTION 22.04.110 WAIVER

- The disposal capacity (29.4 million tons) analyzed in the certified EIR cannot be exceeded
- If the waiver expires or the County does not approve the pending expansion request, Chiquita Canyon Landfill will then be required to initiate the landfill closure process.

### Attachments

- Final EIR Topical Response No. 31, Los Angeles County Code Section 22.04.110 Waiver
- County Code Section 22.04.110 Waiver

# **CCL** Topical Responses

# 31. Los Angeles County Code Section 22.04.110 Waiver

#### Summary of Comments

Comments were made regarding the County of Los Angeles' issuance of a waiver pursuant to Los Angeles County Code (County Code) section 22.04.110. Commenters stated that Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) should not be permitted to operate because it reached its total maximum capacity authorized under its 1997 Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and that Los Angeles County should not have issued such a waiver. In addition, comments were made stating that an addendum to the previously certified Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should not have been issued, and that a subsequent EIR was instead required.

#### Response

#### **Issuance of Waiver**

The Director of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP) on March 17, 2016, issued a waiver to CCL pursuant to Los Angeles County Code Section 22.04.110 (Waiver). The Waiver authorized the continued operation of CCL in the event that the total maximum tonnage capacity allowed by Condition 46 of the existing CUP was reached before the environmental review and public hearing process for a new CUP could be completed.

CCL is operating currently pursuant to CUP No. 89-081, approved in 1997, which authorized a total capacity of 23 million tons within a defined disposal "envelope." Daily and weekly tonnage limits are also imposed. LADRP is reviewing CCL's application for a new CUP, which seeks, in part, to expand CCL's capacity, including, but not limited to, an increase in daily, weekly and total disposal tonnage and an expansion of the horizontal and vertical "envelope" within CCL where waste would be deposited.

CCL requested the Waiver based upon its determination that it would likely reach its total permitted capacity of 23 million tons before the pending CUP application process is complete. CCL did not anticipate the need to increase its permitted daily or weekly tonnage limits or the approved disposal "envelope" and the Waiver requires that those capacity limits not be exceeded.

#### LADRP Findings

The LADRP Director determined that the Waiver should be issued because interim continuation of CCL operation is consistent with the General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan and serves the public convenience and welfare. Closure of CCL during the processing of the current CUP application would result in hardships to waste haulers and local communities, including price increases.

Furthermore, LADRP found that avoiding the temporary closure of CCL will achieve important policy objectives. The interim continuation of CCL operations is consistent with General Plan Policy PS/F 5.1 because it will maintain an efficient, safe and responsive waste management system that reduces waste while protecting the health and safety of the public. Although there are no geographic constraints on the sources of waste collected by CCL, it predominately serves the Santa Clarita Valley and surrounding communities. LADRP found that CCL is forced to close during the processing of CUP No. 2004-00042, waste from these communities will need to be diverted to other landfills located further away, which will increase transportation distances, creating traffic and regional air quality impacts, increasing

greenhouse gas emissions, and increasing costs that will be passed down to County residents. In addition, other landfills may impose out-of-area surcharges, further increasing costs. Overall, closure of CCL during the processing of CUP No. 2004-00042 would result in inefficiencies in the County's waste management system

#### Interim Continuation of CCL Operations Is Consistent with the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan

The LADRP found that the interim continuation of CCL operations is consistent with the Land Use Element of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, a component of the General Plan. CCL is located within the Community Serving land use designation, which allows landfills.

#### Interim Continuation of CCL Operations Serves the Public Convenience and Welfare

LADRP found that the interim continuation of CCL operations serves the public convenience and welfare. Specifically, LADRP stated that denial of the Waiver could result in temporary closure of CCL, which would result in increased traffic and regional air quality impacts; increased greenhouse gas emissions; and increased costs that would be passed down to Los Angeles County residents. County residents served by CCL would no longer have convenient access to waste disposal services and would no longer benefit from competitive pricing for those services. Los Angeles County stated that CCL's ongoing compliance with the operating conditions of CUP No. 89-081, except with respect to the 23-million-ton maximum set forth in the CUP, ensures that CCL is operated in a manner that protects the health, safety, and welfare of Los Angeles County residents.

#### Terms of the Waiver

The Waiver requires CCL to abide by the conditions of the CUP, except that it can continue to operate in the event that it exceeds the maximum capacity stated in its current CUP, subject to the terms and limitations of the Waiver. Terms of the waiver include the following:

- CCL must be operated in compliance with all applicable provisions of the County Code, and with applicable State and federal laws and regulations
- Except with respect to the 23-million-ton maximum set forth in its current CUP, CCL must comply with all conditions of CUP No. 89-081, including but not limited to the daily and weekly net tonnage restrictions
- Waste disposal must take place only within the horizontal and vertical footprint (the waste disposal envelope with the maximum elevation of 1,430 feet) depicted in the existing CUP, and shall not exceed 29 million tons
- The CCL operator must cooperate fully and expeditiously with LADRP in the processing of the pending CUP application
- The CCL operator must provide LADRP with weekly reports detailing, to the satisfaction of the Director, the daily disposal rates within the preceding week, the total amount in tons of waste disposed within CCL, and the remaining capacity within the approved waste disposal envelope
- The CCL operator must cooperate with LADRP's Zoning Enforcement staff to address ongoing concerns related to the operation of CCL

The Waiver shall cease to be effective upon the earlier of the withdrawal, approval or denial of the pending CUP application, July 31, 2017, or the Director's revocation of the Waiver.

#### Addendum to the Previously Certified 1997 Final EIR

Los Angeles County determined that no circumstances exist that would require the preparation of a subsequent environmental impact report under *California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines* Section 15164. The Addendum to the 1997 Final EIR was issued correctly because, as it states, the Waiver will not result in increased environmental impacts compared to the CCL expansion evaluated in the 1997 Final EIR. Although, under the waiver, CCL may exceed its 23-million-ton capacity, doing so will not increase the impacts of the continued operation of CCL, as operational efficiencies have resulted in space remaining within the vertical and horizontal envelope of CCL beyond 23 million tons, so that the additional tonnage can be accommodated within the vertical and lateral envelope of space already evaluated in the 1997 Final EIR. As a result of the Waiver, CCL may continue to dispose of waste within the existing approved envelope on a temporary basis during the CUP application process, which will not increase CCL's impacts.



Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



Richard J. Bruckner Director

March 17, 2016

Chiquita Canyon Attention: Mike Dean, Division Vice President 29201 Henry Mayo Drive Castaic, CA 91384

Dear Mr. Dean:

I am in receipt of your letter dated November 19, 2015, concerning the Chiquita Canyon Landfill at located 29201 Henry Mayo Drive in the unincorporated community of Val Verde. In your letter you request that the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance Section 22.04.110 be waived to avoid temporary closure of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill in the event the landfill reaches the total maximum capacity before the Department of Regional Planning (DRP) can complete the environmental review and public hearing process for a new Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

The landfill filed and Department of Regional Planning (DRP) is currently processing CUP application No. 2004-00042) which seeks, in part, to expand the capacity of the landfill, including, but not limited to, an increase in disposal tonnage and an expansion of the horizontal and vertical "envelope" within the landfill in which waste would be deposited. Currently, the landfill is operating pursuant to CUP No. 89-081 approved in 1997, which authorized a total capacity of 23 million tons within a defined disposal "envelope."

Your letter states the landfill may reach its total capacity of 23 million tons before the processing of the pending CUP application is complete and that existing space within the approved disposal "envelope" will remain available for waste disposal beyond 23 million tons. You also indicated in your letter that closure of the landfill during the processing of the current CUP application would result in hardships to waste haulers and local communities, including price increases. Accordingly, you request that Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") section 22.04.110 be waived.

Section 22.04.110 provides in pertinent part:

No application required pursuant to this [Title 22] shall be accepted for processing or approved where an existing land use, not previously authorized by any statute or ordinance, is being maintained or operated in violation of any applicable provision of this title, or any condition of approval of a land use permit. Chiquita Canyon Mike Dean March 17, 2016 Page 2

However, this same section provides that the prohibition may be waived "[w]here in his sole discretion the director, whose determination shall be final, determines that the use in question is consistent with the objectives, goals and policies of the General Plan, or that the continuation of said use is essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare...."

We have reviewed the circumstances that relate to your request. We have also reviewed and considered the certified final environmental impact report (FEIR) associated with CUP No. 89-081, along with the Addendum to the FEIR prepared pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines section 15164. Based on our review, we find that no circumstances requiring the preparation of a subsequent environmental impact report set forth in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 exist, and grant a limited waiver request as set forth more fully below.

#### Status of Current CUP Application

Based on projections and estimates at this time, we understand there may be a short time period during which the landfill will have reached capacity but the public hearing/appeal process would not have yet concluded.

We understand from waste disposal information provided by the Department of Public Works that the landfill may reach 23 million tons of capacity by November 2016; we further understand that this is an estimate only, and that capacity could be reached sooner or later than November 2016.

With respect to the landfill's current CUP application (CUP No. 2004-00042), although a draft environmental impact report has been circulated to the public, no hearing before the Regional Planning Commission has been scheduled at this time. Furthermore, if, in its sole discretion and after conducting one or more public hearing sessions on the project, the Regional Planning Commission approves the CUP, we anticipate the approval will be appealed to the Board of Supervisors for consideration, which would hold one or more public hearing sessions to consider the appeal. Based on our experience, this public hearing/appeal process may not conclude before the landfill reaches 23 million tons of capacity.

#### **Environmental Analysis**

In connection with the Board of Supervisors' approval of the CUP for the landfill in 1997, a draft environmental impact report (DEIR) was prepared by the Department which analyzed, among other things, the environmental impacts associated with disposal of a maximum of 29.4 million tons of waste in the landfill, including the vertical and horizontal expansion of the landfill required to accommodate 29.4 million tons of waste disposal.

Ultimately, the Board of Supervisors elected to limit waste disposal in the landfill to 23 million tons within a defined disposal envelope. This alternative was disclosed in the FEIR in the "Board of Supervisors Preferred Alternative," which analyzed:

- Weekly average waste disposal of 5,000 tons per day;
- 23 million ton disposal limit;
- Vertical expansion within the landfill of 78.3 acres;
- Horizontal expansion within the landfill of 103 acres; and
- A maximum permit duration of 22 years.

The Board ultimately approved the Board of Supervisors Preferred Alternative, as reflected in CUP No. 89-801.

The Addendum prepared in connection with your request discloses that, although the landfill is approaching its 23 million ton capacity, operational efficiencies have left space within the vertical and horizontal envelope analyzed and approved as part of the Board of Supervisors Preferred Alternative.

As explained in the Addendum, the landfill seeks only to continue to dispose waste within the existing approved envelope on a temporary basis during the current CUP application process, and in conformance with all other conditions of CUP No. 89-081. The Addendum appropriately updates the analysis of the DEIR and FEIR with respect to the current request. After considering the Addendum along with the FEIR for the project, we conclude the Addendum is the appropriate environmental document pursuant to CEQA, and that none of the circumstances requiring a subsequent environmental impact report identified in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 have occurred or are present here.

#### Interim Continuation of Landfill Operations Is Consistent with the General Plan

We find that the interim continuation of landfill operations is consistent with General Plan Policy PS/F 5.1, which states "Maintain an efficient, safe and responsive waste management system that reduces waste while protecting the health and safety of the public." Although there are no geographic constraints on the sources of waste collected by the landfill, it predominately serves the Santa Clarita Valley and surrounding communities, such as portions of the San Fernando Valley. If the landfill is forced to close during the processing of CUP No. 2004-00042, waste from these communities will need to be diverted to other landfills located further away, which will increase transportation distances. Increased transportation distances will create traffic and regional air guality impacts, increase greenhouse gas emissions, and increase costs that will be passed down to County residents. In addition, other landfills may impose out-of-area surcharges, further increasing costs; for example, the Simi Valley Landfill imposes a surcharge on waste from outside Ventura County and the Lancaster Landfill imposes a surcharge on waste from outside the Antelope Valley. Overall, closure of the landfill during the processing of CUP No. 2004-00042 will result in inefficiencies in the County's waste management system, which is inconsistent with General Plan Policy PS/F 5.1. As set forth more fully below, this limited waiver is granted subject to the landfill's ongoing compliance with the operating conditions of CUP No. 89-081, except with respect to the 23 million ton maximum set forth

#### Chiquita Canyon Mike Dean March 17, 2016

in that CUP, which will protect the health and safety of the public, consistent with General Plan Policy PS/F 5.1.

#### Interim Continuation of Landfill Operations Is Consistent with the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan

We find that the interim continuation of landfill operations is consistent with the Land Use Element of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, a component of the General Plan. The landfill is located within the Community Serving land use designation, which allows landfills.

#### Interim Continuation of Landfill Operations Serves the Public Convenience and Welfare

For the reasons explained above with respect to General Plan consistency, we find that the interim continuation of landfill operations serves the public convenience and welfare. Denial of this waiver request may result in temporary closure of the landfill, which will result in increased traffic and regional air quality impacts; increased greenhouse gas emissions; and increase costs that will be passed down to County residents. County residents served by the landfill will also no longer have convenient access to waste disposal services and will no longer benefit from competitive pricing for those services. The landfill's ongoing compliance with the operating conditions of CUP No. 89-081, except with respect to the 23 million ton maximum set forth in the CUP, ensures the landfill is operated in a manner that protects the health, safety, and welfare of County residents.

#### Terms of This Waiver

The Department is charged with balancing not only hardships which may accrue to the landfill operator and local communities if the landfill should be forced to close during the processing of CUP No. 2004-00042, but also with ensuring that interim operation of the landfill results in minimal impacts to the surrounding Val Verde community. We believe the operating conditions of CUP No. 89-081 strike the appropriate balance between landfill operations and the local community, and further believe some additional terms and limitations are necessary to maintain this balance and to ensure the above General Plan and public convenience and welfare findings continue to be met.

Therefore, the Department is granting you a limited waiver, subject to the following:

- 1. This waiver shall not be effective for any purpose unless and until: (a) the landfill reaches its 23 million ton capacity; and (b) the landfill operator/applicant and the owner of the subject property, if other than the landfill operator/applicant, have filed with the Department an affidavit stating they are aware of, and agree to accept, the terms and limitations of this approval. The affidavit must be filed within 30 days of the date of this letter.
- 2. During the effective period of this waiver, the provisions of County Code section 22.04.110 shall not preclude DRP from processing the pending CUP application despite the landfill's accepting of waste in excess of the 23 million ton maximum set

forth in Conditions Nos. 9(g) and 46 contained in CUP No. 89-081, provided the applicant/landfill operator complies with all of the following terms and limitations:

- (a) The landfill must be operated in compliance with all applicable provisions of the County Code, and with applicable State and federal laws and regulations;
- (b) Except with respect to the 23 million ton maximum set forth in Conditions Nos. 9(g) and 46 of CUP No. 89-081, the landfill must comply with all conditions of CUP No. 89-081, including but not limited to the daily and weekly net tonnage restrictions;
- (c) Waste disposal in the landfill must take place only within the horizontal and vertical footprint (the waste disposal envelope with the maximum elevation of 1,430 feet) depicted on the approved Exhibit "A" to CUP No. 89-081, and in no event shall exceed 29.4 million tons as analyzed in the FEIR for CUP No. 89-081;
- (d) The applicant/landfill operator must not carry out or cause to be carried out any activity on the landfill site which would result in a new environmental impact or a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact previously identified in the FEIR for CUP No. 89-081;
- (d) The applicant/landfill operator must cooperate fully and expeditiously with the Department in the processing of the pending CUP application (CUP No. 2004-00042), including but not limited to promptly responding to requests for information by Department staff;
- (e) The applicant/landfill operator must provide the Department with weekly reports detailing, to the satisfaction of the Director, the daily disposal rates within the preceding week, the total amount in tons of waste disposed within the landfill, and the remaining capacity within the approved waste disposal envelope; and
- (f) The applicant/landfill operator must cooperate with the Department's Zoning Enforcement staff in addressing any ongoing concerns related to the operation of the landfill. The applicant/landfill operator must respond to any request for information from staff in an expeditious manner. Any inspection by the Department, which in the sole discretion of the Director is required to monitor compliance with the terms and limitations of this waiver, must be paid by the applicant/landfill operator at the rate of \$200 per inspection. The applicant/landfill operator shall reimburse any other County department for any inspection required by that department to monitor compliance with the terms and limitations of this waiver.
- 3. This waiver shall cease to be effective for any purpose upon the earlier of the following:

- (a) The pending CUP application (CUP No. 2004-00042) is withdrawn, approved, or denied, and such withdrawal, approval, or denial becomes final; or
- (b) July 31, 2017; or
- (c) This approval is revoked by the Director.
- 4. If this waiver ceases to become effective for any purpose, and the landfill has accepted waste in excess of 23 million tons, the landfill operator shall initiate the landfill closure process as required by CUP No. 89-081.
- 5. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul this approval. The County shall promptly notify the permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall reasonably cooperate in the defense.
- 6. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the applicant shall within ten days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in Regional Planning's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, attorneys' fees and expenses, including but not limited to County Counsel fees and expenses, and other assistance to the applicant or the applicant's counsel. The applicant shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:
  - (a) If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount of the initial deposit, the applicant shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of \$5,000. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.
  - (b) At the sole discretion of the applicant, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents shall be paid by the applicant in accordance with County Code Section 2.170.010.

7. This waiver, and compliance with the terms and limitations hereof, shall not form the basis for establishing any vested right to use the site or any structure at the site for any use or activity which requires a discretionary approval by the County of Los Angeles. Compliance with the terms of this waiver shall not be construed as an indication or assurance that the Regional Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve the pending CUP application (CUP No. 2004-00042), or

that any particular conditions will be acceptable to the Regional Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors.

- 8. This waiver does not run with the land and may not be transferred.
- 9. Notwithstanding anything set forth herein, the terms and provisions of Items 4, 5, 6,
  7, and 8, above, shall become immediately effective upon the issuance of this letter and shall survive the effectiveness of this waiver.

If the Department finds the landfill has failed to comply with any of the above terms and limitations, this waiver will be automatically revoked, without prior notice, and the provisions of County Code section 22.04.110 will immediately apply.

The Director, in his sole discretion, may also revoke this waiver if he finds that use of the subject property pursuant to this waiver no longer meets the findings required by County Code section 22.04.110. In such case, we will provide you with 14 days' notice that this approval will be revoked, and revocation will be effective on the 15th day following the date of the notice.

I trust the waiver is acceptable to the landfill. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Oscar A. Gomez of my staff at 213-974-6483, Monday through Thursday between 7:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. or <u>ogomez@planning.lacounty.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Bruckner Director of Planning

RB:JS:SA:OG:RG: rg

Attachment

# Summary of Comments

• Testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing expressed concerns regarding potential air quality and health impacts, as described in the table below.

# Applicant Rebuttal

The following table provides a summary of the commenters concerns, the findings of the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR),<sup>1</sup> and the location of supporting information and findings in the Final EIR. The table is followed by more detailed discussion.

| Comment/Concern   | Findings of the Final EIR  | Final EIR Section  |
|---|--|--|
| Particulate matter in the Los Angeles<br>area showed 66 days above the standard<br>in 2014.                                       | Findings of the Final EIR show no basis for this<br>comment. South Coast Air Quality<br>Management District (SCAQMD) Santa Clarita<br>ambient monitoring data show 0 days of<br>exceedances of state or federal particulate<br>matter standards in 2014. | Final EIR Section 11.3.3; Final<br>EIR Section 11.6; Topical<br>Response #1a in Volume 2 of<br>the Final EIR             |
| Lives may be at risk due to impacts to human health.  | Findings of the Final EIR show no scientific basis for this comment.   | Topical Response #1e and<br>Topical Response #21 in<br>Volume 2 of the Final EIR   |
| Cumulative cancer risk would exceed the threshold value, resulting in significant and unavoidable cumulative health risk impacts. | This cumulative impact finding is explained in detail in the Final EIR, and is the result of an extremely conservative set of assumptions and risk analyses.   | Final EIR Section 11.9.2.3;<br>Topical Response #1e and<br>Topical Response #21 in<br>Volume 2 of the Final EIR          |
| Health risks would be elevated in the nearby Val Verde community.   | Predicted impacts on human health due to<br>emissions from the Proposed Project are less<br>than significant, including:   | Final EIR Section 11.6 Impact<br>AQ-7, Topical Response #1e,<br>and Topical Response #21 in<br>Volume 2 of the Final EIR |
|   | <ul> <li>Impacts to nearby sensitive receptors<br/>(i.e., schools and residences)</li> </ul>   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Predicted increases in health risks in<br/>nearby communities</li> </ul>  |  |
| Landfill working operations on the East<br>Ridge would affect the adjacent school.  | Predicted impacts on human health due to<br>emissions from the Proposed Project are less<br>than significant, including:   | Final EIR Section 11.6 Impact<br>AQ-7; Topical Response #1e<br>and Topical Response #21 in<br>Volume 2 of the Final EIR  |
|   | <ul> <li>Impacts to nearby sensitive receptors<br/>(i.e., schools and residences)</li> </ul>   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Predicted increases in health risks in<br/>nearby communities</li> </ul>  |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

| Comment/Concern   | Findings of the Final EIR  | Final EIR Section  |
|---|--|--|
| The Final EIR presents "cancer risk" maps.  | The location of the nearest sensitive<br>receptors are shown in Final EIR Figures 11.4<br>and 11.5. These figures have been<br>erroneously characterized by members of the<br>public as "cancer risk" maps, which they are<br>not. They simply show the location of the<br>nearest sensitive receptors for human health<br>risk, for which the analysis shows impacts<br>that are less than significant. | Final EIR Figure 11.4,<br>Maximum Health Impact<br>Locations from Proposed<br>Project Construction and<br>Operation 2003 OEHHA<br>Guidance   |
|   |  | Final EIR Figure 11.4,<br>Maximum Health Impact<br>Locations from Proposed<br>Project Construction and<br>Operation 2015 OEHHA<br>Guidance   |
| Landfill gas (LFG) collection efficiency<br>and waste truck fleet mix used in the<br>analysis would not adequately<br>characterize potential impacts. | The air quality and health impact analyses in<br>the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR were<br>revised to address SCAQMD comments.<br>Detailed responses to these comments are<br>provided in the Final EIR.  | Final EIR Volume 2, responses<br>to SCAQMD's comments<br>regarding LFG collection<br>efficiency and waste collection<br>truck fleet mix (Comments<br>296-14 and 296-18,<br>respectively) |
| Air quality tests and the health study<br>show that the Val Verde 2016 death rate<br>is two times the rate for the rest of the<br>country.            | Findings of the Final EIR show no scientific basis for this comment.   | Topical Response #1e and<br>Topical Response #21 in<br>Volume 2 of the Final EIR   |

#### Air Quality – Described in the Final EIR

Chapter 11, Air Quality, of the Final EIR, addresses existing conditions and potential impacts to air quality and human health from the Proposed Project. Specifically:

- Existing ambient levels of particulate matter (Final EIR Section 11.3.3)
- Impacts to air quality from the Proposed Project (Final EIR Section 11.6)
- Impacts to human health from the Proposed Project (Final EIR Section 11.6 AQ-7)
  - Impacts to nearby sensitive receptors (i.e., schools and residences)
  - Health risks to nearby communities
- Cumulative impacts to human health (Final EIR Section 11.9.2.3)

#### **Existing Levels of Particulate Matter**

 Table 11-3 in the Final EIR showed no days of exceedances of the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) or National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) at the Santa Clarita monitoring station in 2014. A single exceedance of the CAAQS was reported in 2009. No exceedances of the CAAQS or NAAQS for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) were recorded at the Reseda Monitoring Station.

For additional information see Topical Response #1a.

#### Impacts on Air Quality from the Project

• Section 11.6.3 in the Final EIR described the potential impacts to air quality from the Proposed Project. Table 11-8 showed that the Project would exceed the SCAQMD mass daily significance criteria for all
pollutants except carbon monoxide (CO) and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>). Table 11-9 showed that the Proposed Project would not exceed the ambient thresholds for any pollutants except  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$ . Tables 11-10 and 11-11 show that the Proposed Project would not cause a localized exceedance of the CO Standards.

The highest estimated combined daily construction and operation emission totals for each pollutant are presented in Table 11-8 of the Final EIR. The combined worst-case daily construction and operation emissions for the Proposed Project would exceed the SCAQMD mass daily operational thresholds for nitrogen oxides (NOx), reactive organic gases (ROG), PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. These estimated increases in maximum daily emissions represent worst-case daily emission estimates, given the conservative approach of combining operation and construction emission estimates for the highest emission year to determine maximum daily emissions, and the variability of facility operation and construction activities on a day-to-day basis.

Table 11-9 of the Final EIR provides a summary of the modeled results for combined worst-case onsite construction and operation emissions, background levels, and total predicted concentrations with comparisons to the applicable ambient air quality thresholds. PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations would be above the localized significance thresholds (LSTs) for each of the applicable averaging periods. Concentrations of all other pollutants would be below the ambient standards listed as significance thresholds in Table 11-6 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR and Final EIR.

A CO hotspot analysis of the intersections that would be affected by the Proposed Project and dispersion modeling of CO emissions, that would result from operational activities, were conducted to evaluate whether an air quality standard for CO would be violated. Tables 11-10 and 11-11 in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR and Final EIR present the peak 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations for three scenarios: existing conditions in 2015, 2017 conditions without the Proposed Project, and 2017 conditions with the Proposed Project. The analysis shows that the maximum 1-hour CO concentrations would be well below the national 1-hour standard of 35 parts per million (ppm) and the state 1-hour standard of 20 ppm under all scenarios. The maximum 8-hour concentration also would be well below the national and state 8-hour standards of 9 ppm. The Proposed Project would not cause an exceedance of the CO ambient air standards.

For additional information see Topical Response #1d.

# Impacts to Human Health from the Project

- Tables 11-12 and 11-13 in the Final EIR show that the Proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD significance criteria for human health risk for residential maximally exposed individuals (MEIRs), residential maximally exposed individual (MEIW) workers, or sensitive receptors.
- The location of the MEIRs and MEIWs are shown in Final EIR Figures 11.4 and 11.5. These figures have been erroneously characterized by members of the public as "cancer risk" maps, which they are not. They merely show the location of the nearest sensitive receptors for human health risk, for which the analysis shows impacts that are less than significant.
- Emissions from the Proposed Project may create an incremental increased risk, and this increase is determined not to be significant. The health risks, which were calculated in a conservative manner as described previously, would not substantially contribute to the existing risks for the surrounding community.

A health risk assessment (HRA) was conducted to evaluate potential human health risks associated with exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. The risk categories evaluated include individual lifetime cancer risk, non-cancer health effects from chronic (long-term) exposure, and non-cancer health effects from acute (short-term) exposure. At the recommendation of SCAQMD staff, the

CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL APPLICANT REBUTTAL AIR QUALITY AND PUBLIC HEALTH

HRA was performed following both the previous guidance outlined in the *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines* (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment [OEHHA], 2003), and the latest guidance outlined in the *Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments* (OEHHA, 2015).

Tables 11-12 and 11-13 in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR and Final EIR present the predicted cancer and non-cancer health risks associated with lifetime and workplace exposures to the combined operation and construction emissions estimated for the Proposed Project. Results obtained using the 2003 guidance are presented in Table 11-12, and results for the 2015 guidance are presented in Table 11-13.

Maximum impacts predicted for the Project at the MEIR, MEIW, and sensitive receptor locations using the 2003 or 2015 OEHHA guidance would not exceed the SCAQMD cancer risk significance threshold of 10 in 1 million, under any of the scenarios. The location of the MEIR and MEIW are shown in Final EIR Figures 11.4 and 11.5. The chronic and acute (chronic hazard index [HIC] and acute hazard index [HIA]) non-carcinogenic impacts predicted for exposure to estimated Proposed Project emissions would be below the SCAQMD significance threshold of 1.0 for all receptors.

The Final EIR suggests that emissions from the Proposed Project may create an incremental increased risk, and this increase is determined not to be significant. Health risks, which were calculated in a conservative manner as described previously, would not substantially contribute to the existing risks for the surrounding community.

For additional information see Topical Response #1e and Topical Response #21.

# Cumulative Impacts to Human Health

• The cumulative impact finding is explained in detail in the Final EIR, and is the result of an extremely conservative set of assumptions and risk analyses.

As described in Section 11.9.2.3 in the Final EIR, the maximum cumulative combined construction and operational impact for predicted lifetime cancer risk, using the 2015 OEHHA guidance, at the location of the MEIR was predicted for the Proposed Project plus cumulative projects. The MEIR, MEIW, and sensitive impacts are predicted for a receptor location 200 meters west from the facility boundary in the proposed Newhall Ranch development.

The proposed additional development for Newhall Ranch would not only increase the emissions of toxic air contaminants generated in the area, but would also add new residential, commercial, and sensitive receptors. The emissions and impacts would, for the most part, be localized around each respective project. Using the 2015 OEHHA guidance, cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase cancer risk by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the landfill project site, indicating a significant cumulative impact.

The HIC and HIA non-carcinogenic cumulative impacts from construction and operation would be below the SCAQMD significance threshold of 1.0.

For additional information see Topical Response #1e and Topical Response #21.

## Landfill Gas Collection Efficiency

• Response to Comment 296-14, in Volume 2 of the Final EIR, indicates that the LFG collection efficiency was calculated by Golder Associates, and the report showing the calculation methodology was presented in Appendix H-4 of the Final EIR.

Fugitive LFG emission rates and capture efficiency can be found in Appendix H-4 of the Final EIR (Golder Report), as well as the emission calculations in Appendix H-2 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. The Chiquita Canyon Landfill Compliance Test on LFG Flare #2 source test report, prepared by Horizon Air

Measurement Services (INC Test #C33-013-FR) for SCAQMD and dated February 16, 2012, was used to characterize flare and fugitive LFG emissions.

For additional information see Response to Comment 296-14 in Volume 2 of the Final EIR.

## **Collection Truck Fleet Mix**

• Reclassification of collection trucks from medium-heavy duty diesel vehicles to heavy-heavy duty diesel vehicles (HHDV) would not change the significance finding described in Section 11.6.3 of the Final EIR.

To determine if reclassification of the collection vehicles would result in a change to the conclusions in the Air Quality Chapter, emissions were recalculated assuming all HHDV waste collection trucks. Under this scenario, SO<sub>2</sub>, NOx, fugitive PM<sub>10</sub>, and fugitive PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions would increase. Emissions of diesel particulate matter from vehicle exhaust, as PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, CO, and ROG, would decrease.

Modeled ambient concentrations resulting from the Proposed Project-related emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> would exceed the applicable LSTs. Increases in emissions associated with reclassification of waste collection trucks would not lead to any new exceedances. Modeled ambient concentrations resulting from the project-related emissions of NOx and SO<sub>2</sub> would not exceed the applicable thresholds, as shown in the Final EIR. Increases in emissions associated with reclassification of waste collection trucks are not expected to lead to any new exceedances, because emissions from onsite operational vehicles were not a primary driver for modeled concentrations at offsite receptors. Decreases in diesel particulate matter from vehicle exhaust associated with reclassification of waste collection trucks would result in similar or lower-predicted cancer and non-cancer health risks associated with lifetime and workplace exposures to the combined operation and construction emissions estimated for the Proposed Project. The Final EIR indicated the Proposed Project cancer and non-cancer health risk impacts were already less than significant. Decreases in diesel particulate matter from vehicle exhaust associated with reclassification of waste collection trucks would lower predicted cumulative cancer risk below the significance threshold.

Based on these preliminary findings, it is anticipated that a reclassification of all collection trucks to HHDVs would not result in a change to the significance or findings of impacts to air quality for the Proposed Project.

For more information, see Response to Comment 296-18.

# Attachments

- Final EIR Topical Response #1, Air Quality
- Final EIR Topical Response #21, Public Health

# **CCL** Topical Responses

# 1. Air Quality

# 1a. Existing Air Quality and Emissions, Monitoring, and Health Effects

Commenters stated that existing operations at Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) result in air contaminant emissions, exposures to pollutants, nuisance odors, and health effects. They also stated that the air quality monitoring data used in the study are not adequate to characterize existing air quality conditions at CCL and in the surrounding neighborhoods. Commenters requested monitoring for pollutants such as vinyl chloride, hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and other chemicals in the immediate vicinity of the landfill, with release of the results to the public.

# **Response – Existing Air Quality**

Existing air quality conditions in the Proposed Project area are described in Chapter 11, Air Quality, of the Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Chapter 11, Air Quality (Final EIR) also describes the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board (CARB) processes for attainment and nonattainment designation.

CEQA does not require analysis of impacts from baseline (existing permitted conditions), only the potential impacts of the Proposed Project. However, existing air quality and pollutant concentrations in the project area are provided and discussed in the revised air quality chapter of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. Table 11-1 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR includes a list of current best management practices (BMPs) and emission reduction measures at CCL. Table 11-1 includes current emission reduction measures and BMPs incorporated as project design measures, including BMPs to reduce construction, operation and composting emissions.

# **Response – Air Monitoring**

The Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning used ambient air quality monitoring data available from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) in the analysis presented in the Draft EIR for the Proposed Project. The air monitoring stations and data selected for use in the air quality impact analysis are described in the revised air quality chapter of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. These stations and the reported data were deemed adequate to support the air quality impact analysis for the following reasons: (1) the data for each pollutant of concern were collected at the closest available approved monitoring station in the Proposed Project vicinity, (2) the monitored results provide information on pollutants as deemed necessary by the air agencies with jurisdiction, and (3) the monitoring stations are part of the statewide network, maintained and operated by the local air quality regulatory agency, SCAQMD, according to very strict protocols.

SCAQMD continuously operates a network of ambient air quality monitors in the Los Angeles basin, including several locations near the landfill. The air monitoring stations monitor for the pollutants that the state and local air quality agencies consider to be pollutants of concern, and the stations are operated according to strict protocols for sampling, analysis, and data validation and reporting. As described in Section 11.3.3.2, the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR used 6 years of validated ambient air monitoring and meteorological data (2009 to 2014) from the closest SCAQMD-operated monitoring stations in Santa Clarita, Reseda, and Burbank to characterize existing ambient air quality and meteorological conditions in the study area. In addition, as described in Section 11.5.2, the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR used 3 years of measurements from CCL-operated wind monitoring equipment at

the western boundary of CCL to characterize local wind patterns in the study area, specifically to evaluate the potential for offsite odors.

The data selected for use in the health risk analysis are described in the revised air quality chapter and Appendix H of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. Results of sampling and chemical analysis of landfill gas (LFG) at the flare inlet and outlet were used to estimate the fugitive LFG and combustion-related emissions used in the study, including methane, ammonia, vinyl chloride, hydrogen sulfide, diesel particulate matter, and 14 other chemicals detected in testing (Appendix H, Table H-2).

Section 2.2.8.7, Air and Landfill Gas Monitoring, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Project Description chapter, provides a detailed discussion of landfill gas monitoring. Specifically, this section states: "Title 27 requires all landfills to have an approved LFG monitoring plan that includes multi-level LFG monitoring probes around the site boundary. CCL has a Title 27 LFG monitoring plan approved by the Lead Enforcement Agency and California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. Monitoring is performed in a manner consistent with this Title 27 LFG monitoring plan."

Section 2.2.8.7, Air and Landfill Gas Monitoring, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Project Description, also specifies that, "Monitoring consists of:

- Monthly instantaneous landfill surface monitoring to evaluate potential emissions on the landfill surfaces
- Quarterly integrated landfill surface monitoring to evaluate potential emissions on the landfill surfaces
- Ambient air sampling at the landfill site boundaries to evaluate the potential offsite migration of landfill emissions
- Quarterly and annual reporting to present the results of the preceding activities to the SCAQMD for review".

Additionally, "The monitoring program is designed for CCL to identify surface emissions of LFG at the earliest possible moment." Figure 2-9 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR shows the location of existing and proposed LFG monitoring probes. Because monitoring is performed consistent with regulatory requirements, there is no requirement or need for offsite gas probes to be installed.

For additional information on all the types of monitoring conducted for the facility, commenters are referred to Topical Response #10, Environmental Monitoring.

# Response – Health Effects from Pollutants in Ambient Air under Existing Conditions

The revised air quality chapter of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR presents the maximum monitored concentrations of criteria pollutants in ambient air in Table 11-3 of the air quality chapter, as measured at SCAQMD-approved monitoring stations. Table 11-3 also notes the number of times the applicable standards have been exceeded each year from 2009 to 2014. Maximum monitored values can be compared to the applicable air quality standards listed in Table 11-5 of the air quality chapter to evaluate the extent to which the standards have been exceeded. The potential health effects of exposure to particulate matter less than 2.5 or 10 micrometers in aerodynamic diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>/PM<sub>10</sub>) and other criteria pollutants in ambient air are described in Chapter 11, Section 11.3.3.2, Air Monitoring Data.

# 1b. Applicable Requirements and Regulatory Setting

# **Summary of Comments**

Commenters requested updated information on compliance with recent plans and laws, such as CARB's May 2014 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, Assembly Bill (AB) 1826 organic waste recycling

requirements, and AB 1594 reduction, recycling, and composting requirements. Many of the comments and questions requested clarification and expansion of the discussion regarding SCAQMD plans, rules, permits, and regulations applicable to the Proposed Project.

#### Response

The revised air quality chapter of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR was updated to reflect the applicable requirements of the CARB AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, AB 1826 organic waste recycling requirements, and AB 1594 reduction, recycling, and composting requirements.

The Original Draft EIR Chapter 11, Air Quality, and Chapter 11, Air Quality, Section 11.4, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR analyze and document the federal, state, and SCAQMD plans, rules, and regulations applicable to the Proposed Project. As stated, general conformity is not applicable to the Proposed Project, because the General Conformity Rule only applies to federal actions, and there is no federal action associated with the Proposed Project. The CEQA does not require analysis of plans, rules, or regulations applicable under the baseline, existing permitted conditions, only those applicable to the Proposed Project. For information on requirements applicable to the existing landfill operations, the Title V permit issued for the facility by SCAQMD documents all applicable and enforceable regulatory air quality requirements, and lists all the permit conditions for existing sources and operations. Monitoring reports documenting the results of all required compliance monitoring are submitted biannually to SCAQMD, and compliance is certified annually by the CCL staff acting as the Responsible Party for the Title V facility.

The Proposed Project would include waste collection and haul trucks not owned or operated by CCL. The fleet owners and operators would be responsible for the compliance of these trucks with applicable SCAQMD and CARB standards. The Proposed Project would continue ongoing compliance with existing, applicable rules and permit conditions, and would comply with future requirements that become applicable to the Proposed Project, for example, the facility would prepare and implement fugitive dust plans as required under SCAQMD Rule 403.

# 1c. Emission Sources Associated with the Proposed Project and Methods Used to Calculate Emissions

## **Summary of Comments**

Commenters requested information on the emissions sources associated with the Proposed Project and the emission calculation methodology used to estimate emissions associated with construction and operation of the Proposed Project.

#### **Response – Emission Sources**

The revised air quality chapter and Appendix H of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR analyze and document the sources, emissions, and air quality and health risk impacts associated with the Proposed Project, including tailpipe and fugitive emissions from construction, offsite waste haul truck travel, flare operations, fugitive LFG, grading, composting, and landfill operations. Emissions were not calculated for the LFG-to-energy plant, because operations associated with this facility were assumed to be included with existing conditions and would not change with the Proposed Project. The LFG-to-energy plant would continue operation with or without the Proposed Project.

Emissions associated with construction and operational sources and the extent, duration, and phasing of construction of the Proposed Project have been discussed in the revised air quality chapter and Appendix H of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. Appendix H provides information on the assumed vehicle miles travelled values and emissions factors used in emissions estimation for the haul trucks and

other mobile sources. The tools used to estimate emissions from mobile sources use emission factors developed for existing and future vehicle fleets, based on federal, state, and local regulatory requirements and surveys of regional fleets conducted by CARB. Construction and operations emissions estimated for the Proposed Project have been combined and conservatively compared to SCAQMD operational Significance Thresholds.

# **Response – Methods Used to Calculate Emissions**

The revised air quality chapter and Appendix H of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR have been updated to provide information on the methodologies used and the results obtained through emission estimation, dispersion modeling, and health risk assessment, including the assumptions regarding potential daily maximum emissions and their frequency. The methods and models used in the dispersion modeling and health risk assessment are discussed in more detail in Topical Responses #1d and #1e, respectively.

# 1d. Methods and Models Used in Air Dispersion Modeling, and Impacts to Surrounding Neighborhoods

# **Summary of Comments**

Comments were received regarding the methods and models used in air dispersion modeling, and their adequacy and accuracy to predict potential air quality impacts. Commenters requested detailed analysis and dispersion modeling to further analyze impacts associated with particulate matter from the proposed mixed organics composting facility. Commenters also requested additional analysis of impacts associated with the prevailing wind patterns and the proposed increases in landfill elevation on existing and future receptors in surrounding neighborhoods.

One commenter requested that nitrous oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>), sulfur dioxide, and carbon (CO) modeled results should be further evaluated by incorporating the analysis of at least one additional air dispersion model. The commenter believes that all dispersion modeling systems are conservative, and further analysis would provide results more representative of the actual impacts of the landfill. The commenter requests information on the maximum emissions levels used in the analyses, including the frequency of maximum emissions on a daily and annual basis.

## Response

The Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning used available and SCAQMD-approved ambient air quality monitoring and meteorological data in the dispersion modeling analysis presented in Chapter 11 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR for the Proposed Project. The monitoring and meteorological data, including wind data, are described in more detail in Topical Response #1a and Chapter 11 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. The dispersion modeling was performed using approved and recommended South Coast Air Quality Management District dispersion modeling guidance and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-approved dispersion model, AERMOD, to predict the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

At the request of the SCAQMD, impacts that would be associated with construction and operation of the Proposed Project were evaluated based on the estimated and combined construction- and operation-related emissions, including emissions from composting (Topical Response #1c). Information on predicted maximum emissions levels and the project years with highest potential emissions was developed. The daily emission rates estimated for each of the pollutants in their worst-case year were conservatively compared to the daily mass emission operations thresholds established as CEQA significance criteria by SCAQMD.

The combined worst-case daily construction and operation emissions for the Proposed Project would exceed the SCAQMD daily operational thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub>, reactive organic gas (ROG), PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. These estimated increases in maximum daily emissions represent worst-case daily emission estimates, given the conservative approach of combining operation and construction emission estimates for the highest emission year to determine maximum daily emissions, and the variability of facility operation and construction activities on a day-to-day basis. Days when construction activities would not occur would result in lower emissions.

The potential impacts associated with the combined construction and operational emissions from onsite sources for the Proposed Project were analyzed using the AERMOD dispersion modeling system. Proposed increases in landfill elevation were included in the model inputs. Results of the modeling were added to representative background levels and compared to the ambient air quality concentrations recommended as significance thresholds, which include both SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) and some of the federal and state ambient air quality standards.

Consistent with the SCAQMD LST methodology, the potential impacts from the combined worst-case construction and operation emissions from onsite sources for the Proposed Project were evaluated for the nearest receptor locations. Modeled results for combined worst-case onsite construction and operation emissions, background levels, and total predicted concentrations, were compared to the applicable ambient air quality thresholds. PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations would be above the LSTs for each of the applicable averaging periods. Concentrations of all other pollutants would be below the ambient standards listed as significance thresholds.

In summary, daily emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> from construction and operation would exceed the SCAQMD mass daily operational thresholds, and modeled ambient concentrations resulting from the project-related emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> would exceed the applicable LSTs. On this basis, air quality impacts associated with combined emissions from construction and operation of the Proposed Project would be significant, and additional mitigation measures were evaluated for their feasibility of implementation. With additional mitigation, impacts from construction and operation of the Proposed Project would be reduced, but would remain potentially significant and unavoidable.

Localized impacts due to CO emissions from the Proposed Project were assessed using the SCAQMDrecommended California LINE Source Dispersion Model, Version 4. The CO hotspot modeling was performed according to the methodology outlined in the University of California, Davis *Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol* (Niemeier, Eisinger, Kear, Chang, & Meng, 1997), which is accepted by SCAQMD for CEQA analysis.<sup>1</sup> Maximum 1-hour and maximum 8-hour CO concentrations were estimated for comparison to the national and state 1-hour and 8-hour standards. Results of the CO hotspot analysis are presented in Section 11.6.3.2, and indicate that the Proposed Project would not cause an exceedance of the CO ambient air standards.

Section 11.9 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Air Quality chapter presents the results of an assessment of the potential for cumulative impacts resulting from operation and construction of the Proposed Project in conjunction with emissions from other reasonably foreseeable projects in the area. The additional foreseeable projects consisted of 13 residential developments, three commercial developments, five industrial developments, and one transportation improvement project. Additional receptors were placed in areas of future development to evaluate potential cumulative air quality impacts for the future developments including schools, residences, and businesses. Project Design Measures and mitigation measures to reduce potential significant impacts on air quality due to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The California Department of Transportation CO hotspot protocol covers the hot spot analysis process for conformity in California and is accepted for CO analysis by SCAQMD.

emissions from the Proposed Project were identified. Additional control measures for the other proposed projects in the area may be included and incorporated within their project-specific implementation plans. Most of the emissions generated from other nearby projects would be from increases in associated passenger and commercial vehicle traffic, and from off-road construction equipment used to build the developments. The overall cumulative impact from construction and operational activities would be significant and unavoidable for NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

# 1e. Methods and Models Used in Health Risk Assessment, and Impacts to Surrounding Neighborhoods

# **Summary of Comments**

Comments were received regarding the methods and models used in the health risk analysis, and their adequacy and accuracy to predict health risks and protect public health. Commenters requested additional school notification and further analysis of the potential for health risk impacts at area schools and residences in surrounding neighborhoods, both existing and future. Commenters requested that the analysis also include diesel truck emissions from the increase in waste disposal trucks which would enter and exit the site, emitting diesel particulate matter.

One commenter indicated that the analysis years of 2016, 2021, and 2032 do not adequately evaluate the cancer risk associated with a lifetime of exposure from living in the vicinity of the landfill. The commenter opines that the document incorrectly defines the significance of the Proposed Project when compared to SCAQMD thresholds, both as a result of incomplete analysis and limitations of the models used in the analysis. Voicing concerns that risks for the Proposed Project are underestimated, the commenter refers to a preliminary environmental analysis prepared in 2005 by graduate students at University of California Irvine, which predicted higher health risks for a hypothetical landfill expansion project. Other studies were also provided regarding the effects of air pollution on public health and children's' health.

## Response

The Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning used approved and recommended SCAQMD modeling guidance and risk assessment guidance from the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) to predict the potential health risk impacts associated with the Proposed Project. Both the 2003 OEHHA guidance and the 2015 OEHHA guidance documents were used, because the Original Draft EIR utilized the 2003 OEHHA guidance and the guidance has been updated since that time. Chapter 11 and Appendix H of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR describe the sources, toxic air contaminant emissions estimates, receptor locations, and potential health risk impacts predicted for the Proposed Project. The health risk assessment evaluated potential exposures to emissions from construction, offsite waste haul truck travel, flare operations, fugitive LFG, grading, composting, and landfill operations over the 30-year lifetime of the Proposed Project.

The revised air quality chapter and Appendix H of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR have been updated to provide information on the methodologies used and the results obtained through emission estimation, dispersion modeling, and health risk assessment, including the assumptions regarding exposure durations and potential health hazards. Evaluation of existing emissions, ambient concentrations, and health impacts is not within the scope of this analysis, therefore only incremental impacts have been evaluated. Health risks have been estimated for chronic and acute exposures to combined construction and operations emissions estimated for the Proposed Project, and results have been compared to SCAQMD Significance Thresholds.

Results indicate that the Proposed Project would result in carcinogenic, chronic, and acute health risks that would be less than significant, compared to SCAQMD significance criteria. Existing and proposed locations of sensitive receptors, such as schools and childcare facilities, were included in the health risk assessment, in accordance with SCAQMD and OEHHA guidance. The Notice of Availability of the DEIR was sent to both the Castaic Union School District and the Hart Union School District.

Health risks have been estimated in a conservative manner which may substantially overstate the risks associated with the Proposed Project. The actual risks associated with the Proposed Project are expected to be less than those presented in the Partially Recirculated DEIR. Based on the findings of the Original Draft EIR, Chapter 11, Air Quality, as well as the Air Quality Supplement included in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would not result in significant health risk impacts.

Section 11.9.2.3 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR presents the results of health risk assessment for potential cumulative impacts resulting from human exposures to emissions from operation and construction of the Proposed Project in conjunction with emissions from other reasonably foreseeable projects in the area. As indicated in Topical Response #1d, the additional foreseeable projects consisted of 13 residential developments, three commercial developments, five industrial developments, and one transportation improvement project. Additional receptors were placed in areas of future development to evaluate potential cumulative air quality impacts for the future developments including schools, residences, and businesses. Project Design Measures and mitigation measures to reduce emissions from the CCL Proposed Project were identified. Additional control measures for the other proposed projects in the area may be included and incorporated within their project-specific implementation plans. Most of the emissions generated from other nearby projects would be from increases in associated passenger and commercial vehicle traffic, and from off-road construction equipment used to build the developments.

The proposed additional development in the area would not only increase the emissions of TACs generated in the area, but would also add new residential, commercial, and sensitive receptors. The emissions and impacts would, for the most part, be localized around each respective project. Using the 2015 OEHHA guidance, cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project would increase cancer risk by more than the 10 in 1 million threshold for residences, workers, and sensitive receptors near the Proposed Project site, indicating a significant cumulative impact.

Please also refer to Topical Response #21, Public Health, which provides responses to comments regarding the health risk assessment provided in the revised air quality chapter of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR; the potential for additional health risks in the surrounding community; and the uncertainties associated with attribution of symptoms and adverse effects to project emissions.

# 1f. Methods Used in Evaluating Odor Impacts, Methods for Odor Mitigation, and Odor Impacts to Surrounding Neighborhoods

Odor impacts, BMPs, and mitigation measures are described in detail in Chapter 11 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. See Topical Response #17 for a complete response to comments received related to Odor.

# 1g. Enforcement of Mitigation Requirements

# **Summary of Comments**

Commenters requested a description of how BMPs and emissions limits would be enforced for the Proposed Project.

## Response

Chapter 11, and Appendix H of the Air Quality Supplement included in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR analyze and document all the sources, emissions, and air quality and health risk impacts associated with the Proposed Project. Combined construction and operations emissions estimated for the Proposed Project are compared to SCAQMD Significance Thresholds. To address air quality significant impacts associated with the Proposed Project, a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting plan (MMRP) would be implemented and enforced by the lead agency, the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, as part of the Conditional Use Permit. For requirements applicable to the existing landfill operations, the Title V permit issued for the facility by SCAQMD documents all applicable and enforceable regulatory air quality requirements, and lists all the permit conditions for existing sources and operations. Monitoring reports documenting the results of all required compliance monitoring are submitted biannually to the SCAQMD, and compliance is certified annually by the Responsible Party for the Title V facility. The Proposed Project would continue ongoing compliance with existing, applicable rules and permit conditions, and would comply with future requirements that become applicable to the Proposed Project. For example, the facility would update the Title V permit as requirements change or emission sources are added or modified, and would prepare and implement fugitive dust plans as required under SCAQMD Rule 403.

The MMRP, included in the Final EIR, is a tool to aid in compliance with the design features, best management practices, and mitigation measures described in the EIR for the Proposed Project. Each measure listed includes one or more actions required. For each of these actions, the MMRP identifies mitigation timing, responsible party, and monitoring agency or party. The Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning is the Lead Agency for enforcing compliance with the MMRP.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

# 21. Public Health – Draft January 15, 2017

# 21a. Health Risk Assessment for Project Emissions

Commenters have stated that the Proposed Project at the Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) would result in exposures to air contaminants and landfill gas emissions, which would produce impacts to public health. They state that an inadequate analysis has been conducted of health risks potentially associated with the Proposed Project. Contrary to the findings of the health risk assessment, commenters state that significant human health risks would be associated with emissions from the Proposed Project.

# **Response – Health Risk Assessment**

Public health concerns with the construction and operation of the landfill have been addressed by preparing a health risk assessment that includes potential cancer-causing effects and potential noncancer effects from facility emissions of toxic air contaminants. The health risk assessment, included in Chapter 11 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR and Final EIR, was prepared in accordance with guidelines published by the state of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The health risk assessment has been prepared in a manner that substantially overstates the risks associated with facility emissions, in order to provide more assurance that the Proposed Project does not produce significant impacts to public health. The health risk assessment is based on assumptions which are "conservative". In other words, these assumptions are intended to overstate rather than understate the potential for human exposure to project emissions. Examples of these conservative assumptions include estimating "worstcase" pollutant emissions from the facility; estimating the levels of pollutants (or concentrations) in air based on worst-case meteorological conditions, including consideration of the wind-speeds and wind directions that would result in the highest pollutant concentrations in air from the Proposed Project; estimating potential human exposure based on a hypothetical maximum exposed individual, who is assumed to be located at the point where the highest pollutant concentrations in air will be found. A resident who is a maximum-exposed individual is assumed to be located at that point for 24 hours per day, 350 days per year, over a lifetime. The methods used to evaluate cancer risks from facility emissions are designed to provide the highest possible (or upper-bound) estimate of risk to the hypothetical maximum-exposed individual. The methods used to evaluate the potential for other kinds of adverse health effects (noncancer effects) are based on protection of sensitive members of the population.

The cumulative effect of all of these assumptions is that the risk associated with emissions from a facility is substantially overstated. Human health risks associated with emissions from a facility are unlikely to be higher at any other location than at the location of the maximum exposed individual. If there is no significant impact associated with concentrations in air at the hypothetical maximum exposed individual location, it is unlikely that there would be significant impacts in any location in the vicinity of the facility. The results from the health risk assessment are then compared with stringent thresholds to determine if the risks, estimated with these very conservative methods, are considered significant. The thresholds for assessing cancer risks, which can range from a risk of 1 in one million to 10 in one million for all types of cancers, are a small fraction of the risk of cancers from existing causes. SCAQMD has defined a significant impact for the California Environmental Quality Act as a 10 in 1 million incremental lifetime cancer risk. The threshold for assessing other adverse, noncancer health effects is based on estimated exposures not exceeding a pollutant-specific Reference Exposure Level (REL). A REL is a pollutant concentration in air that is intended to protect the public, including sensitive populations, and is based

on the most sensitive health effect associated with that pollutant. Chronic non-cancer health risks are assessed by comparing the predicted annual ground level concentrations of toxic air contaminants (TACs) (the potential exposure levels) to the chronic RELs developed by OEHHA to obtain a hazard index for chronic impacts (HIC). The acute non-cancer health risks are assessed by comparing the 1-hour maximum TAC ground level concentrations with the acute RELs developed by OEHHA to obtain the hazard index for acute impacts (HIA). The HRA included in the Air Quality chapter of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR demonstrated the chronic and acute non-carcinogenic impacts (HIC and HIA) predicted for exposure to estimated Proposed Project emissions would be below the SCAQMD significance threshold of 1.0 for all receptors.

# 21b. Project Emissions Result in Additional Risks to the Surrounding Community

Commenters stated that emissions from the Proposed Project would add health risks to communities already subjected to numerous environmental burdens. Commenters stated that many of the project impacts, such as emissions of diesel particulate matter and carcinogenic volatile organic compounds, are already present in the air in Los Angeles County at levels posing unacceptable health risks.

# **Response – Additional Health Risks from Project Emissions**

Emissions from the Proposed Project represent an incremental change in risks from existing conditions. An objective of the Air Quality Impact Analysis is to analyze that increment and determine if it is significant. Environmental and public health officials have studied the health risks associated with the existing conditions in order to develop policies and requirements for feasibly reducing those risks. One example of these studies is the Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study (MATES), which has been conducted by the SCAQMD. The latest version of this study, MATES-IV, was published in 2014. The results from this study indicates there are some communities in Los Angeles County where emissions of toxic air pollutants are associated with estimated lifetime cancer risks of greater than 1,200 in one million from all sources (mobile and stationary sources). The results of the MATES-IV study indicate that motor vehicles and other mobile sources of air pollution are the predominant source of cancer-causing toxic air pollutants in the Basin, and that the largest contributor to total cancer risk is from diesel particulate matter (PM) emissions. The results from MATES-IV indicate that total estimated cancer risks in the area around the Proposed Project (the Castaic area, including the Val Verde community), from all emissions sources, are approximately 300 to 400 in one million. While the SCAQMD stresses these results do not represent actual health outcomes associated with potential exposure to toxic air pollutants (they are based on a conservative health risk assessment), they provide an indication of the differences in estimated risks at different locations within the South Coast Air Basin. As described in the Public Health Evaluation technical memorandum (Appendix M), maximum impacts to human health projected for project-related air toxics emissions in the health risk assessment for the Proposed Project are a very small fraction (approximately 2 to 3 percent) of the existing health impacts projected for air toxics in the South Coast Air Basin. It is unlikely that combined risk impacts from project emissions and existing air toxics levels in the area would be significantly different from the existing estimated risks.

The California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) was developed by OEHHA to assess the cumulative impacts of environmental pollution in California communities. CalEnviroScreen combines indicators of environmental impacts, such as exposure to fine PM, ozone and diesel PM in air, pesticide use, toxic releases from industrial facilities, traffic density, drinking water quality, presence of cleanup sites, impaired surface water bodies, and siting of solid and hazardous waste facilities, with population characteristics information including proportion of children and elderly in a Census tract, occurrence of asthma-related emergency room visits, low-birth-weight births, educational attainment, linguistic isolation, poverty and unemployment, to produce an overall CalEnviroScreen score. These scores allow the ranking of communities in California in terms of overall environmental health impact. Based on the indicators evaluated in CalEnviroScreen, the census tract

containing the Proposed Project ranks in the 66th to 70th percentile of California census tracts for cumulative impacts (Appendix M). This is similar to the calculated impacts for census tracts located to the west of the census tract containing the Proposed Project site. Pollutant burdens in the census tract around the Proposed Project site are ranked higher by CalEnviroScreen than adjoining census tracts to the north, east and south. However, it does not rise to the level of a disadvantaged community as defined under Senate Bill 535. Examining CalEnviroScreen 3.0 results for all of Los Angeles County identifies many communities with higher scores, for example, Los Angeles, Gardena, Glendale, Long Beach, North Hollywood and Pico Rivera, located in the valley, further to the south of the project site.

While emissions from the Proposed Project may create an incremental increased risk, this increase is determined not to be significant. The health risks, which were calculated in a conservative manner as described previously, would not substantially contribute to the existing risks for the surrounding community.

# 21c. Project Emissions are Associated with Symptoms and Adverse Effects

Some commenters have stated there are occurrences of symptoms and adverse health effects from exposure to volatile compounds in landfill gas, such as hydrogen sulfide and vinyl chloride, and that additional health studies are needed before making a decision regarding the Propose Project.

# **Response – Symptoms and Adverse Effects from Project Emissions**

The public health impacts which have been analyzed for proposed construction and operation of the landfill have multiple possible sources and causes. This makes it difficult to relate causes (such as emissions from landfill operations) to impact (such as occurrence of symptoms or health effects) with any degree of certainty. Understanding these potential relationships involves careful, systematic study. A recent systematic study of health effects around landfills concluded that health outcomes observed from the existing studies are not specific for emissions from municipal landfill sites. In a few cases, there have been weak associations between landfills and health effects, but it is cautioned these also may be due to chance, bias or emissions from sources other than a landfill (Appendix M).

Another approach for systematically studying pollutant exposures and potential health risks is to conduct a health risk assessment for project emissions. The health risk assessment uses methods that systematically estimate "worst-case" health risks, and then compares those worst-case risks with highly stringent health thresholds, as a way to offset uncertainties associated with health risks from environmental exposures.

Individual reports of symptoms are useful in identifying where potential health impacts should be tracked or studied, but by themselves are not sufficient to establish a relationship between emissions and health impacts. Disease trends such as asthma and cancer, which have some potential relationships with contaminants found in project emissions, have been analyzed to determine if the community surrounding the project site is exposed to any unique health impacts.

The occurrence of asthma in Los Angeles County is measured from statistics collected by the Los Angeles Department of Public Health. Asthma incidence in Los Angeles County is tabulated by Service Planning Areas (SPA). The prevalence of asthma in communities around the project site falls within the range observed for all eight SPAs across Los Angeles County designated by the Los Angeles Department of Public Health. Asthma prevalence in SPA 2 (San Fernando area in the northern portion of Los Angeles County where the Proposed Project is located) is indistinguishable from the asthma prevalence elsewhere in Los Angeles County. Similarly, the cancer mortality rates for selected cancers (lung cancer and leukemia) in SPA 2 are not distinguishable from mortalities estimated for Los Angeles County. These two types of cancer were selected because they have a relationship with constituents in emissions from the Proposed Project: lung cancer (may be associated with exposure to diesel particulate matter) and leukemia (may be associated with exposure to benzene) (Appendix M).

# Summary of Comments

• Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing have claimed that the landfill has odor impacts in surrounding communities.

# **Applicant Rebuttal**

- Only one notice of violation for odors has been issued to Chiquita Canyon by the South Coast Air Quality Management District in nearly 10 years. This is in comparison to 205 notices of violation issued to Sunshine Canyon in the past 8 years.
- Last year, on its own initiative, Chiquita Canyon hired Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE), a nationally recognized firm specializing in odor analysis, to conduct an independent Odor Survey at Chiquita Canyon Landfill.
- SWAPE concluded that the landfill does not create significant odor impacts to the surrounding community.
- Three trained SWAPE odor specialists collected 2,025 sampling data points over a 25-day period in the community surrounding the landfill. Only 5 of the 2,025 data points (only 0.2%) were potentially associated with landfill odors in Val Verde.
- When verified odors have occurred, they appear to be correlated to light winds blowing toward the community of Val Verde, which only occurs approximately 6 percent of the time.
- During the past 14 years, under the current management, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has consistently been proactive in addressing potential odors. Chiquita Canyon focuses on preventing problems before they occur instead of reacting to problems after they occur. Many of the proactive control measures put in place at Chiquita Canyon have set the standard for measures at Sunshine Canyon that were dictated by the regulatory agencies in response to problems at that site.
- Chiquita Canyon can be proactive in addressing issues because its onsite management is empowered by the company to address potential odor problems immediately, in order to stay ahead of the game. They have full authority to do whatever is needed when there is a need. Other companies do not trust the local management and require lengthy bureaucratic reviews and approvals before problems can be studied, solutions developed, and equipment or changes in policies put in place.
- A list of Chiquita Canyon's best management practices for odor control (many of which were industry firsts in Southern California) include:
  - Understanding Site-specific Conditions:
    - A site-specific meteorological study was commissioned over a decade ago to understand the site topography and meteorological conditions that create potential pathways for odor movement.
  - Source Control:
    - Refusing to do business with potential customers who generate highly odorous trash.
    - Rejecting trucks at the scales when there is an obvious highly odorous load.
    - If a highly odorous load passes the scales undetected, but is detected while unloading, protocol requires that such waste be buried immediately to control odors.

- Best Operating Practices Disposal:
  - The size of the working face expands to accommodate disposal demand peaks but then shrinks when demand subsides to minimize odors.
  - Shrinking is achieved by covering the working face throughout the day as opposed to once at the end of each day.
  - The landfill routinely exceeds the state minimum standards and textbook rules-of-thumb for the use of soil and other beneficial use material to cover trash and other areas of the landfill. This is done to proactively minimize odors from fresh trash and to prevent landfill gas from escaping through the soil surface on the landfill
  - Over a mile-long perimeter misting system that neutralizes odors before they can migrate offsite.
  - The use of large portable fans to control the direction of air flow and to dilute odors generated at the tipping area.
- Best Operating Practices Landfill Gas Management:
  - Installation of landfill gas collection wells before they are needed.
  - Most landfills install gas collectors in response to either odor or gas monitoring exceedances.
- Chiquita Canyon typically installs collectors 6 months to 2 years before they start collecting gas. This early installation removes the guesswork of when to install more wells. When the routine monitoring indicates an approaching need they are simply turned on, proactively controlling odors before they are detected.

# Attachments

- Final EIR,<sup>1</sup> Chapter 11, Regarding Odor
- Final EIR Topical Response #17, Odor
- Final EIR Topical Response #34, Beneficial Use
- SWAPE Report

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

generated in the landfill escapes as fugitive emissions. See Appendix H-4 for details. Several actions are taken to minimize these emissions:

- Gauge pressure is negative at the gas extraction well.
- Nitrogen and oxygen concentrations are monitored to minimize excess air infiltration.
- LFG temperatures at the gas extraction wells are monitored to limit the potential for subsurface fires.
- CH<sub>4</sub> concentrations across the landfill surface are monitored to prevent seeping of CH<sub>4</sub> gas from the landfill surface.
- Per the Proposed Project BMP, the landfill will be operated to improve LFG collection efficiency to a site-wide average of 85 percent through application of a combination of daily cover, intermediate cover, and final cover to provide a beneficial improvement in ongoing LFG collection efficiency.<sup>2</sup>

# 11.5.1.2 Mobile Source Emissions

## **Fugitive Dust Emissions**

Fugitive dust emissions are generated during operation and construction of the landfill by the following activities:

- Excavation and grading activities
- Unloading of collection vehicles
- Heavy equipment operations (scrapers, bulldozers, compactors, graders, and water trucks) that apply daily and intermediate cover to refuse, compact refuse and soil, maintain haul road conditions, and work the face of the landfill
- Management of soil stockpiles
- Landfill liner installation and final cover construction
- Truck travel on paved and unpaved roads

## Mobile Source Tailpipe Exhaust Emissions

Mobile source tailpipe exhaust emissions are generated from the following sources during operation and construction of the landfill:

- Onsite service trucks and heavy equipment
- Collection trucks, transfer trucks, and passenger vehicles that deliver solid waste and yard waste
- Passenger vehicles associated with landfill employees

# 11.5.2 Local Wind Patterns

Because wind patterns can change greatly, particularly around a steep-sided canyon such as that at CCL, data from wind monitoring equipment located on the western boundary of CCL were used to evaluate local wind patterns, specifically for evaluating the potential for offsite odors. Three consecutive years of wind data from the CCL wind monitoring equipment (2012 through 2014) were available for use in this odor analysis. Local wind roses were developed for the available CCL data (Figure 11-3).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This BMP is based on the SCS Engineers Memorandum dated November 2016 (SCS, 2016a), presented in Appendix H-3, which provides an evaluation of the benefits of cover modifications to improve LFG collection efficiency at CCL. Improvements to the existing site-wide LFG collection efficiency are modeled using a methodology developed by the Solid Waste Industry for Climate Solutions (SWICS, 2009), which allows for adjustment of collection efficiency within a range of values by cover type. By optimizing the landfill surface area converted to intermediate and final (impermeable membrane) cover, ongoing LFG collection efficiency can be increased at the landfill from current levels (estimated at 81.7%) to 85 percent, and maintained at this level by management of cover, reducing fugitive emissions of GHGs and TACs from the landfill.







11-3b Daytime (8am to 8pm) Wind Rose



11-3d June to August Wind Rose

**Figure 11-3. Chiquita Canyon Landfill Wind Roses** *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision* 



Figure 11-3a presents a wind rose based on 3-year wind data collected from CCL. The data show that winds in the immediate project area blow primarily from west to east. About 12 percent of the winds in this direction have speeds lower than 9 mph. About 10 percent of the winds blowing in this direction have speeds between 9 and 14 mph. Stronger (over 14 mph) winds were infrequently observed in this prevailing direction. For approximately 10 percent of the time, winds blow from northeast to southwest. The wind occurrences and wind speeds from all other directions are low.

Local wind patterns associated with time changes and seasonal changes also were evaluated. Figures 11-3b and 11-3c show the daytime (8 a.m. to 8 p.m.) and nighttime (8 p.m. to 8 a.m.) wind roses using the data from CCL. The daytime wind rose (Figure 11-3b) is similar to the 3-year wind rose (Figure 11-3a), with even more frequent winds from the west. The nighttime wind rose (Figure 11-3c) shows lighter winds, blowing primarily from the northeast and east. Most of the time the night winds are below 5 mph.

Figure 11-3d shows the wind rose in summertime (June through August), based on the data from CCL. The CCL local wind rose indicates the same wind pattern in summer as in the daytime, with winds blowing from west to east.

Generally, the wind roses plotting the local wind data from CCL show local winds blowing primarily from west to east during the daytime and summer months and light winds from northeast and east during the nighttime, with winds blowing infrequently toward the community of Val Verde.

# 11.5.3 Sources of Odor at CCL

Two potential sources of odor are from landfill and composting operations: aerobic (with air) decomposition of incoming organic waste, and gases produced by anaerobic (without air) bacterial digestion of buried waste.

Odors may result from incoming waste after it is emptied from the truck and before it is composted or completely covered in the landfill. Any resulting odor is from the aerobic decomposition of organic waste materials. Most of the organic matter that enters the facility, including cooked and uncooked foods and garden wastes, has begun to decompose before being delivered. These wastes are aggressively managed to minimize odors that would potentially leave the landfill area during the day, as described in the following subsection.

Anaerobic digestion of the buried waste produces LFG, the second source of odors. LFG consists primarily of  $CO_2$  and  $CH_4$ , which are generally odorless, as well as trace amounts of volatile organic gases and odorous compounds. As these natural gases are produced within the landfill, internal pressures move the gases along the paths offering the least resistance, which may be vertically through a permeable cover.

Odors may occur as LFG moves through porous soils or when cracks develop in the landfill surfaces due to landfill settlement, or at points of penetration of the landfill surface, such as those for LFG collection piping, allowing the gases to escape into the environment.

# 11.5.4 Current Odor Management Strategies at CCL

Best operating practices for management of aerobic sources of odor at CCL are described below:

# **Best Operating Practices – Source Control**

- The most effective method used to control odors associated with incoming trash is CCL's waste exclusion program. CCL can and does refuse to do business with customers or potential customers who generate highly odorous loads.
- CCL rejects trucks at the scales when there is an obvious highly odorous load.

- CCL selectively chooses to exclude trash loads from specific locations and on specific days of the week if there is a history of odorous loads.
- If a highly odorous load is detected while unloading, that waste is immediately covered to control odors.

## **Best Operating Practices – Disposal**

- The size of the working face expands to accommodate disposal demand peaks, but then "shrinks" when demand subsides to minimize odors.
- The "shrinking" is achieved by covering the working face regularly throughout the day.
- As needed, CCL covers portions of the working face multiple times during the day to minimize the surface area of exposed trash and potential odors.
- CCL regularly exceeds state minimum standards and textbook rules-of-thumb for the use of soil and other beneficial use material to cover trash and other areas of the landfill. This is done to proactively minimize odors from fresh trash.
- CCL has a perimeter odor control system, which consists of a meteorological station located on the western boundary of the landfill that provides real-time information on wind speed and wind direction, plus a perimeter misting system over 1 mile long attached to the litter fence located along the western and northern boundaries of the waste disposal area. When the combination of weather conditions and odorous loads have the potential to result in offsite migration of odors, CCL disperses odor neutralizing agents through the nozzles.
- CCL utilizes large portable fans that can move nearly 1 million cubic feet per minute of air to help control the direction of air flow and to dilute and disperse odors generated at the tipping area.

Management of anaerobic sources of odor at CCL is described below:

To prevent the release of odorous gases from anaerobic digestion, an extensive LFG collection and control system (GCCS) has been installed at CCL. The collected LFG is either used as fuel in the onsite power plant (LFGTE plant) or combusted in a LFG flare. Landfill surfaces are monitored regularly for evidence of gaseous emissions. When emissions are detected, they are corrected by adjusting the GCCS, or recompacting the cover soils, or both. Proper maintenance of the soil cover (e.g., repairing cracks), application of a combination of daily cover, intermediate cover, and final cover to provide a beneficial improvement in ongoing LFG collection efficiency, and efficient operation of the GCCS are also effective at controlling LFG odors.

CCL typically installs LFG collection wells 6 months to 2 years before the landfill starts collecting gas. This early installation removes the guess work of when to install more wells. When routine monitoring indicates the need for additional gas collection, the collection wells are simply turned on, proactively controlling gas and resulting odors before odors are detected.

CCL's LFG collection system is addressed by a Title V Permit to Operate issued by SCAQMD. The Title V permit includes specific conditions/mitigation measures with which CCL must comply. Conditions 22 and 23 of the Title V permit address odor from construction of the LFG collection system, and require mitigation measures to be implemented if odors during construction of the LFG system are detected beyond the property line.

For composting operations, CCL has previously controlled odors by maintaining aerobic conditions in the windrows where yard waste was deposited for composting. The compost windrows were monitored for temperature, oxygen content, and moisture on a daily basis to provide odor and process control.

CCL has an Odor Hotline (phone number: 661-253-5155) the public can call to report odor complaints, allowing faster, more direct action to be taken to resolve the complaint.

# 11.5.5 Odor Complaints

The impact of an existing odor source on surrounding sensitive receptors is evaluated by identifying the number of confirmed or verified complaints received for that specific odor source. The SCAQMD thresholds chart states that the threshold for odor is the creation of a nuisance under SCAQMD Rule 401 (SCAQMD, 2015d). Rule 402 does not set forth a quantitative threshold for this determination, and in consultation with SCAQMD staff, it was agreed that this EIR would apply the numerical standard developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) (SCAQMD, 2015c). BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines recommend reviewing odor complaints from the past 3 years for the source in question. BAAQMD considers a source to have a substantial number of odor complaints if the complaint history includes five or more confirmed complaints per year averaged over a 3-year period (BAAQMD, 201<u>2</u>0).

A verified complaint is any complaint in which the Air Quality Management District inspector performs an odor survey in response to the complaint and confirms the presence of an odor outside the landfill boundaries that can be attributed to the landfill. Odor complaint records for CCL were requested from SCAQMD. Below is a summary based on the results for 8 years of public records requests for odor complaints submitted to SCAQMD:

- August 2007 to July 2012: 3 verified odor complaints, or an average of 0.6 confirmed complaints per year over this 5-year period.
- August 2012 through August 2015: 23 verified odor complaints occurred on a total of 11 days during this 37-month time period. Additionally, CCL received a Notice of Violation (NOV) for odor on 1 additional day, for a total of 12 confirmed odor events over a 37-month period, or an average of 3.9 odor complaints (categorized as odor events) per year.

While the specific locations of odor complaints verified by SCAQMD are not known, the general location of these complaints is considered to be the community of Val Verde, located northwest of CCL. Among the recent verified odor complaints by SCAQMD, specific complaint times were available for four odor events. Wind data for these times were obtained from the CCL monitoring station and are summarized below. The intent is to evaluate the correlation between the monitored wind conditions and the odors reported and verified at Val Verde. The meteorological data from Santa Clarita station between year 2014 and 2015 are not publically available; therefore, similar analysis cannot be conducted using Santa Clarita data.

Wind direction is represented with the unit of degree from which the wind blows. The direction starts from zero degree at North, then goes clockwise. Winds from the direction between approximately 110 degrees and 165 degrees are generally considered to be blowing towards Val Verde.



Odor event No. 1 was reported on January 26, 2015, between 9:51 a.m. and 10:26 a.m. During that hour, wind directions changed from west to southeast then to north-northeast. The southeast wind direction at 10 a.m. was consistent with detectable odors at Val Verde. Wind speed was less than 5 mph.

| Time                 | Wind speed (mph) | Wind direction (degrees) |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 1/26/2015 9:45 a.m.  | 2.2              | 275                      |
| 1/26/2015 10:00 a.m. | 2.5              | 130                      |
| 1/26/2015 10:15 a.m. | 4.7              | 70                       |
| 1/26/2015 10:30 a.m. | 4.7              | 67                       |

Odor event No. 2 was reported on December 24, 2014, from 11:17 a.m. to 12:29 p.m. During this period, the winds generally blew from southeast toward Val Verde. This set of data supports the correlation between wind and detectable odors at Val Verde. Wind speed was less than 3 mph.

| Time                  | Wind speed (mph) | Wind direction (degree) |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 12/24/2014 11:15 a.m. | 2.7              | 146                     |
| 12/24/2014 11:30 a.m. | 2.3              | 138                     |
| 12/24/2014 11:45 a.m. | 1.6              | 109                     |
| 12/24/2014 12:00 p.m. | 1.3              | 149                     |
| 12/24/2014 12:15 p.m. | 1.6              | 117                     |
| 12/24/2014 12:30 p.m. | 1.6              | 156                     |

Odor event No. 3 was reported on December 20, 2014, from 9:27 a.m. to 3:06 p.m. During this period, winds blew from the southeast (120 to 150 degrees) for about half of the time, which would correlate with detectable odors at Val Verde. The other times, winds blew from east, west, or northwest. Wind speed was less than 5 mph.

| Time             | Wind speed (mph) | Wind direction (degree) |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 12/20/2014 9:30  | 2.0              | 112                     |
| 12/20/2014 9:45  | 1.54             | 195                     |
| 12/20/2014 10:00 | 1.7              | 135                     |
| 12/20/2014 10:15 | 2.5              | 127                     |
| 12/20/2014 10:30 | 1.9              | 66                      |
| 12/20/2014 10:45 | 2.0              | 190                     |
| 12/20/2014 11:00 | 2.9              | 139                     |
| 12/20/2014 11:15 | 1.8              | 137                     |
| 12/20/2014 11:30 | 1.8              | 112                     |
| 12/20/2014 11:45 | 3.2              | 116                     |
| 12/20/2014 12:00 | 3.0              | 123                     |
| 12/20/2014 12:15 | 2.2              | 155                     |
| 12/20/2014 12:30 | 2.4              | 129                     |
| 12/20/2014 12:45 | 2.1              | 227                     |
| 12/20/2014 13:00 | 2.4              | 99                      |
| 12/20/2014 13:15 | 1.8              | 331                     |

| Time             | Wind speed (mph) | Wind direction (degree) |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 12/20/2014 13:30 | 1.6              | 325                     |
| 12/20/2014 13:45 | 3.3              | 289                     |
| 12/20/2014 14:00 | 4.9              | 275                     |
| 12/20/2014 14:15 | 3.4              | 310                     |
| 12/20/2014 14:30 | 3.3              | 267                     |
| 12/20/2014 14:45 | 3.5              | 258                     |
| 12/20/2014 15:00 | 3.1              | 210                     |
| 12/20/2014 15:15 | 2.8              | 199                     |

This particular odor event on December 20, 2014, resulted in an NOV from SCAQMD and was mitigated within an hour of CCL becoming aware of the issue. The source of the odor was a load of green waste deposited away from the working face, where CCL staff did not immediately notice that the green waste was unusually odorous. The particularly odorous load came from a customer who had a breakdown of his green waste grinding equipment, which resulted in the green waste sitting in the customer's yard much longer than normal and developing a very strong odor before being delivered to CCL. The customer did not notify CCL of the equipment breakdown and subsequent delay in delivery of the green waste to CCL. Following the event, CCL held additional employee training to emphasize the importance of checking green waste loads for odors wherever and whenever they are delivered.

Odor event No. 4 was reported on October 8, 2014, 9:08 a.m. to 9:35 a.m. During this period, the winds generally blew from the southeast toward Val Verde. This set of data also supports the correlation between wind and detectable odors at Val Verde. Wind speed was less than 3 mph.

| Time           | Wind speed (mph) | Wind direction (degree) |
|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 10/8/2014 9:00 | 2.1              | 117                     |
| 10/8/2014 9:15 | 2.3              | 131                     |
| 10/8/2014 9:30 | 2.3              | 126                     |

Currently, according to the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines for odors, CCL does not have a significant odor impact on receptors. When verified odors have occurred, they appear to be correlated to light winds blowing toward the community of Val Verde. According to the CCL wind rose depicted in Figure 11-3a, winds blow toward the community of Val Verde approximately 9 percent of the time. Light winds toward Val Verde, as seen during the four odor events described above, occur approximately 6 percent of the time.

# 11.5.6 Odor Investigation at CCL

Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE) conducted an Odor Survey in the spring and summer of 2015 at CCL to characterize and understand the various odors in and around CCL (SWAPE, 2015). The entire SWAPE Report is included in Appendix H-5.

Three trained odor specialists conducted odor sampling on 25 mornings generally between the hours of 6 a.m. and 10 a.m., when odors have been reported to be the most common. Sampling events took place on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays between April 7, 2015 and July 16, 2015. During each sampling event, 50 to 51 locations were sampled, for a total of 3,789 data points.

Locations were selected to give a thorough geographic distribution of sampling points, including potential receptors such as the Val Verde community. Locations were grouped into 14 location groups inside the landfill and offsite in the surrounding communities.

Odors were described using the following methods: (1) Dilution to Threshold values to quantify the strength; (2) Hedonic Tone to quantify the pleasantness; (3) Odor Descriptors to describe the odor; and (4) Suspected Odor Source to describe whether the odor came from the landfill or elsewhere. Analysis of these parameters showed that the landfill working face had the strongest and most unpleasant odors. Offsite, odors were much weaker and were generally neutral in hedonic tone.

Odors were strongest within the landfill property, specifically at or near the working face. The most common odors detected within the landfill were smells of grass, sage, and other plants, the sweet air freshener smell of the odor control system, rotten and sour trash odors, and musty mulch odors. Trash odors were only detected within the landfill at locations other than the working face when weather conditions were hot, with low or calm winds. However, even during these conditions, trash odors were only rarely detected.

Outside the landfill, odors (regardless of source) were often not detected. In fact, 40 percent of offsite sampling data points contained no odors. Trash odors were rarely detected outside the landfill. Some of these detections were determined not to be landfill-related due to confounding sources of odor, and others were too faint to detect when diluted. Specifically, odors potentially related to the landfill were detected offsite 34 times out of 2,025 offsite sampling data points, or 1.68 percent of the time.

The SWAPE Report concludes that because of the small detection rate of landfill-related odors offsite, the landfill does not create significant odor impacts to the surrounding communities.

# 11.6 Potential Impacts

# 11.6.1 Standards of Significance

# 11.6.1.1 Criteria under CEQA Context

Pursuant to the *CEQA Guidelines*, air quality impacts related to the Proposed Project would be significant if the project would:

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan
- Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations
- Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people

# 11.6.2 Thresholds of Significance

# 11.6.2.1 SCAQMD Thresholds

In addition to the above CEQA significance criteria, SCAQMD has developed emission, air dispersion modeling, and health risk thresholds for CEQA analysis. SCAQMD air quality significance thresholds are shown in Table 11-6. Air quality impacts resulting from construction and operation would be deemed significant if daily emission estimates, air modeling results, or HRA results would exceed the following significance thresholds:

OEHHA adopted a revised risk assessment methodology in 2015. Per the 2015 OEHHA guidance, it was conservatively assumed that operation and construction emissions would occur simultaneously, 24 hours per day continuously for 30 years for residential exposures, and 8 hours per day, 5 days per week, for 25 years for workplace exposures. Though exposure durations decreased, changes to the exposure pathway methodology in the 2015 OEHHA guidance have resulted in overall increases in predicted health risks.

Using the 2015 OEHHA guidance, the incremental increase in lifetime cancer risk associated with exposure to combined construction and operations emissions at the location of the MEIR is predicted to be 9.3 in 1 million. The MEIR location would be approximately 250 meters northwest from the facility boundary. The maximum incremental increase in cancer risk predicted for worker exposures at the location of the MEIW is predicted to be 0.85 in 1 million. The MEIW location would be approximately 220 meters from the facility's northwest boundary. The maximum incremental increase in lifetime cancer risk predicted for the location of the nearest sensitive receptor is predicted to be 1.2 in 1 million. The sensitive receptor location would be approximately 1,750 meters from the facility's northeast boundary. The locations of the maximally exposed receptors using the 2015 guidance for cancer risk and chronic impacts for construction and operation emissions are shown on Figure 11-5. Maximum impacts predicted for the MEIR, MEIW, and sensitive receptor locations using the 2015 OEHHA guidance would not exceed the SCAQMD cancer risk significance threshold of 10 in 1 million, under any of the scenarios.

The chronic and acute (HIC and HIA) non-carcinogenic impacts predicted for exposure to estimated Proposed Project emissions would be below the SCAQMD significance threshold of 1.0 for all receptors.

As noted above, the incremental increase in lifetime cancer risk associated with exposure to combined construction and operation emissions at the location of the MEIR, calculated based on the 2015 OEHHA guidance, was predicted to be 9.3 in 1 million. Because the predicted cancer risk, per individual unit, was greater than 1 in 1 million, the cancer burden was calculated for each census block receptor. Cancer burden is defined as the estimated increase in the occurrence of cancer cases in a population resulting from exposure to carcinogenic air contaminants. Based on the cancer risk estimated using the 2015 OEHHA Guidance, the cancer burden was predicted to be 0.01 excess cancer cases, which is below the SCAQMD threshold of 0.5 excess cancer cases. Based on the cancer risk estimated using the 2003 OEHHA Guidance, the cancer burden was predicted to be 0.004, which is also below the SCAQMD threshold of 0.5 excess cancer cases. The HRA conducted to evaluate exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations demonstrates that the predicted impacts would be less than significant.

## **Project Design Measures**

Same as previously described under Impact AQ-4, and listed in Table 11-1.

*Impact AQ-8:* Expanded landfill operation would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Operation impacts would be less than significant.

<u>Impact Discussion</u>. The Proposed Project would introduce several changes at CCL that could result in an increased potential for odor impacts.

First, the Proposed Project would include an increase in daily waste disposal tonnage, from 6,000 to a maximum of 12,000 tons per day. This would result in an increased potential for odors from the aerobic decomposition of incoming waste, due to additional loads and the increased size of the working face. CCL would continue to actively preempt odors through the landfill's waste exclusion program and through best operating practices for sanitary landfill waste disposal. If odors occur, CCL would continue to aggressively manage such events, using methods such as applying odor neutralizing agents or strategically placing large fans on the landfill to disperse odors.

Second, the Proposed Project would include both a horizontal and vertical expansion of the existing footprint of the landfill. A horizontal extension of the waste footprint would not be expected to result in increased odors because the working face would continue to be covered at least daily. Similarly, while it might seem that a vertical extension of the waste footprint would result in increased odors for nearby receptors, the opposite typically would occur. When the terrain surrounding a landfill is at a higher elevation than the odor sources, as is the case at CCL, larger impacts are seen right at the project boundary, as potential odor plumes do not have the time or buoyancy to elevate before reaching receptors. And as the elevation of the potential odor source increases, potential odor plumes are likely to be found further downwind, which provides more time for odors to disperse in the ambient air, leading to reduced impacts.

Third, the Proposed Project would include the placement of additional waste over a longer period of time, which would contribute to the production of LFG through anaerobic digestion of the buried waste. CCL would continue to operate the GCCS, and would expand the GCCS for the Proposed Project. Landfill surfaces would continue to be monitored regularly for evidence of gaseous emissions. If emissions are found they would be corrected by adjusting the GCCS or recompacting the cover soils, or both.

In order to have mechanisms in place to quickly address odor complaints and issues, CCL will develop an OIMP for landfill operation, as a proactive Odor Reduction Measure. The OIMP will describe an odor monitoring protocol, a description of meteorological conditions that affect migration of odors, a complaint response protocol, a description of design considerations for minimizing odors, and a description of operating procedures for minimizing odors. The OIMP would be reviewed at least annually and revised if necessary.

Based on the above discussion, potential odor impacts from expanded landfill operation associated with the Proposed Project are anticipated to be less than significant.

# Impact AQ-9: Operation of the composting facility would potentially create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Operation impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

The Proposed Project would include a maximum 560 tons per day mixed organics composting facility. Because the compost facility is evaluated as a new use at CCL (the previous compost facility ceased operation in 2009), odors associated with the facility would be potentially significant without processes in place to minimize odor.

Odor management of a composting facility requires knowing and paying attention to the composting process, including feedstock characteristics, odor sources, odor releases, and meteorological and topographic conditions. The conditions that lead to an offsite odor impact can be complex.

All commercial composting facilities in California are required to implement an OIMP, as codified in CCR Title 14 (Natural Resources), Division 7 (<u>CalRecycleCIWMB</u>), Chapter 3.1 (Compostable Materials Handling Operations and Facilities Regulatory Requirements), Article 3 (Report of Facility Information), Section 17863.4 (Odor Impact Minimization Plan). An OIMP would be required for either of the composting options proposed (windrow or aerated static pile).

The OIMP process relies on a philosophy of constant improvement, rather than prescriptive standards. The OIMP must describe design and operational procedures for minimizing odors. The OIMP must also describe topographic and meteorological conditions and a complaint response protocol.

Requirements of an OIMP include:

a) All compostable material handling operations and facilities shall prepare, implement, and maintain a site-specific OIMP. A complete plan shall be submitted to the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA).

(b) OIMPs shall provide guidance to onsite operation personnel by describing, at a minimum, the following items. If the operator will not be implementing any of these procedures, the plan shall explain why it is not necessary.

(1) an odor monitoring protocol which describes the proximity of possible odor receptors and a method for assessing odor impacts at the locations of the possible odor receptors; and,

(2) a description of the meteorological conditions that affect migration of odors and/or transport of odor-causing material offsite. Seasonal variations that affect wind velocity and direction shall also be described; and,

(3) a complaint response protocol; and,

(4) a description of design considerations and/or projected ranges of optimal operation to be employed in minimizing odor, including method and degree of aeration, moisture content of materials, feedstock characteristics, airborne emission production, process water distribution, pad and site drainage and permeability, equipment reliability, personnel training, weather event impacts, utility service interruptions, site-specific concerns, facility enclosure; and,

(5) a description of operating procedures for minimizing odor, including aeration, moisture management, feedstock quality, drainage controls, pad maintenance, wastewater pond controls, storage practices (e.g., storage time and pile geometry), contingency plans (i.e., equipment, water, power, and personnel), biofiltration, and tarping.

(c) The OIMP shall be revised to reflect any changes, and a copy shall be provided to the LEA, within 30 days of those changes.

(d) The OIMPs shall be reviewed annually by the operator to determine if any revisions are necessary.

(e) The OIMP shall be used by the LEA to determine whether or not the operation or facility is following the procedures established by the operator. If the LEA determines that the OIMP is not being followed, the LEA may issue a Notice and Order (pursuant to Section 18304) to require the operator to either comply with the OIMP or to revise it.

(f) If the OIMP is being followed, and the LEA determines, in a manner consistent with Section 18302(d) that -but the odor impacts are still occurring, the LEA shall may direct the operator to prepare and implement an Odor Best Management Practices Feasibility Report (Report) as specified in Section 17863.4.1. The LEA shall consider the results of the Report prior to issuinge a Notice and Order (pursuant to Section 18304) requiring the operator to take additional reasonable and feasible measures to minimize odors, unless:-

(1) the LEA has evidence that a specific and immediate action would reduce the odor impacts;

(2) there is an imminent threat to public health and safety and the environment; or

(3) a nuisance has occurred-

The composting facility is typically inspected monthly or quarterly by the LEA. The LEA determines whether or not the facility has an OIMP and is implementing the practices described in the OIMP. The OIMP would be reviewed at least annually and revised if necessary.

With implementation of the OIMP, potential odor impacts from the Proposed Project as a result of the composting facility are anticipated to be less than significant.

#### Project Design Measures

Project Design Measures related to odor impacts are described above.

# 11.7 Mitigation Measures

Even with continuation of current emission reduction measures and implementation of BMPs as Project Design Measures, the Proposed Project would have potentially significant air quality impacts due to estimated NOx, ROG, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions from construction and operation. Additional mitigation measures were evaluated for their feasibility. Potential mitigation measures evaluated included:

| Potential Mitigation Measure   | Feasibility Evaluation   |  |
|--|--|--|
| Design the site such that any check-in point for trucks is inside the facility to ensure that there are no trucks queuing outside of the facility  | The site entrance has been designed to ensure that<br>CCL can accommodate all Proposed Project traffic<br>without queuing outside the facility.  |  |
| Use certified street sweepers that comply with SCAQMD Rule 1186.1  | Measure is feasible.   |  |
| Have truck routes clearly marked with trailblazer signs so trucks<br>will stay on truck routes established by the lead agency and not<br>enter residential areas   | Because CCL does not own and manage a fleet of<br>waste collection vehicles, it is not possible to enforce<br>the use of specified truck routes. However, given the<br>availability of direct routes to and from CCL, it is<br>unlikely that trucks would choose to utilize a<br>residential area either going to or leaving the site. |  |
| Use innovative approaches to reducing potential air emissions<br>from construction of buildings, such as modular building products,<br>where prefabricated portions of structures are assembled<br>elsewhere and are erected at the construction site, as feasible.<br>This would eliminate the need for onsite painting, a majority of the<br>plumbing, and other consumer product usage. | Measure is feasible.   |  |
| Provide offsetting emission reduction credits for predicted net<br>emission increases from sources requiring permitting under<br>SCAQMD New Source Review regulations.   | Measure is feasible.   |  |

Based on the above discussion, the following mitigation measures have been identified to minimize potentially significant air quality impacts:

- **AQ-1:** The applicant shall use certified street sweepers that comply with SCAQMD Rule 1186.1.
- AQ-2: The applicant shall use innovative approaches to reducing potential air emissions from construction of buildings, such as modular building products, where prefabricated portions of structures are assembled elsewhere and are erected at the construction site, as feasible. This would eliminate the need for onsite painting, a majority of the plumbing, and other consumer product usage.
- **AQ-3:** The applicant shall provide offsetting emission reduction credits for predicted net emission increases from sources requiring permitting under New Source Review regulations.

Additionally, the following mitigation measure has been identified for operation of the composting facility:

• AQ-4: Prior to operation of the composting facility, the applicant shall develop an OIMP pursuant to the requirements of the CCR, Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 3.1, Article 3, and Section 17863.4. The OIMP shall include design considerations and operating strategies to control compost facility odors, up to and including facility enclosure. CCL shall comply with the OIMP during compost facility operation.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

# 17. Odor

Comments were received on the sources of odor at Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL), odor impacts associated with the existing landfill and the Proposed Project, the approach used in the evaluation of odor impacts, the impact of elevation on potential odor impacts, and the implementation and enforcement of odor control and mitigation measures at CCL. Commenters also requested that odor control measures used at Sunshine Canyon Landfill be implemented at CCL.

# Response

The potential for odor impacts as a result of the Proposed Project was evaluated in Chapter 11, Air Quality, of the Original Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). As a result of comments received on the Original Draft EIR, the air quality chapter was revised and included in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. The revised chapter included an expanded discussion of potential odor impacts, including current odor data and associated information on wind patterns in the vicinity of CCL and a discussion of the proposed mixed organics processing/composting facility. The sections below both summarize the odor discussion included in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR and directly respond to comments received related to odor.

# Odor Impact Methodology

The revised air quality chapter of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR uses an odor impact assessment approved for use by the SCAQMD. Because SCAQMD does not have its own odor methodology, the revised air quality chapter uses the methodology used by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). BAAQMD California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines recommend reviewing odor complaints from the past 3 years for the source in question. BAAQMD considers a source to have a substantial number of odor complaints if the complaint history includes five or more confirmed complaints per year averaged over a 3-year period (Chapter 11, Section 11.5.5).

# Local Wind Patterns and Correlation to Odor Complaints

Section 11.5.2, Local Wind Patterns, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR described wind patterns in the vicinity of CCL. Because wind patterns can change greatly, particularly around a steep-sided canyon such as that at CCL, data from wind monitoring equipment located on the western boundary of CCL were used to evaluate local wind patterns, specifically for evaluating the potential for offsite odors. Three consecutive years of wind data from the CCL wind monitoring equipment (2012 through 2014) were available for use in the odor analysis. Local wind roses were developed for the available CCL data (Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, Figure 11-3).

A review of the local wind patterns showed that generally, the wind roses plotting the local wind data from CCL show local winds blowing primarily from west to east during the daytime and summer months and light winds from northeast and east during the nighttime, with winds blowing infrequently toward the community of Val Verde.

For the time period of August 2012 through August 2015, 23 verified odor complaints, as documented by South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), occurred on a total of 11 days during this 37-month time period. Additionally, CCL received a Notice of Violation (NOV) for odor on 1 additional day, for a total of 12 confirmed odor events over a 37-month period, or an average of 3.9 odor complaints (categorized as odor events) per year. Among the recent verified odor complaints by SCAQMD, specific complaint times were available for four odor events. Wind data for these times were obtained from the CCL monitoring station, with the intent to evaluate the correlation between the monitored wind conditions and the odors reported and verified at Val Verde.

The review of local wind patterns and verified odor complaints show that when verified odors have occurred, they appear to be correlated to light winds blowing toward the community of Val Verde. According to the CCL wind rose depicted in Figure 11-3a of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, winds blow toward the community of Val Verde approximately 9 percent of the time. Light winds toward Val Verde occur approximately 6 percent of the time. Currently, according to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines for odors, CCL does not have a significant odor impact on receptors.

#### **Odor Sources**

Sources of odors at CCL and odor control best management practices for landfilling and best management practices and mitigation measures for composting activities at CCL are addressed in the revised Chapter 11, Air Quality, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. The revised chapter describes the results of odor impact analysis for operation-related sources associated with the Proposed Project, including composting operations and future cumulative impacts. CCL currently employs and will be required to implement progressive and aggressive odor management strategies.

#### **Odor Management**

Best operating practices for management of aerobic sources of odor at CCL are described below:

#### **Best Operating Practices – Source Control**

- The most effective method used to control odors associated with incoming trash is CCL's waste exclusion program. CCL can and does refuse to do business with customers or potential customers who generate highly odorous loads. See also Topical Response, #29b, Waste Screening and Acceptance Program.
- CCL rejects trucks at the scales when there is an obvious highly odorous load.
- CCL selectively chooses to exclude trash loads from specific locations and on specific days of the week if there is a history of odorous loads.
- If a highly odorous load is detected while unloading, that waste is immediately covered to control odors.

#### **Best Operating Practices – Disposal**

- The size of the working face expands to accommodate disposal demand peaks, but then "shrinks" when demand subsides to minimize odors.
- The "shrinking" is achieved by covering the working face regularly throughout the day.
- As needed, CCL covers portions of the working face multiple times during the day to minimize the surface area of exposed trash and potential odors.
- CCL regularly exceeds state minimum standards and textbook rules-of-thumb for the use of soil and other beneficial use material to cover trash and other areas of the landfill. This is done to proactively minimize odors from fresh trash. See "Minimizing Odors with Beneficial Use Materials", for more information.

- CCL has a perimeter odor control system, which consists of a meteorological station located on the western boundary of the landfill that provides real-time information on wind speed and wind direction, plus a perimeter misting system over 1 mile long attached to the litter fence located along the western and northern boundaries of the waste disposal area. When the combination of weather conditions and odorous loads have the potential to result in offsite migration of odors, CCL disperses odor neutralizing agents through the nozzles.
- CCL utilizes large portable fans that can move nearly 1 million cubic feet per minute of air to help control the direction of air flow and to dilute and disperse odors generated at the tipping area.

#### Management of Anaerobic Sources of Odor

To prevent the release of odorous gases from anaerobic digestion, an extensive gas collection and control system (GCCS) has been installed at CCL. The collected landfill gas (LFG) is either used as fuel in the onsite power plant (LFG-to-energy plant) or combusted in a LFG flare. Landfill surfaces are monitored regularly for evidence of gaseous emissions. When emissions are detected, they are corrected by adjusting the GCCS, or recompacting the cover soils, or both. Proper maintenance of the soil cover (e.g., repairing cracks), application of a combination of daily cover, intermediate cover, and final cover to provide a beneficial improvement in ongoing LFG collection efficiency, and efficient operation of the GCCS are also effective at controlling LFG odors.

CCL typically installs LFG collection wells 6 months to 2 years before the landfill starts collecting gas. This early installation removes the guess work of when to install more wells. When routine monitoring indicates the need for additional gas collection, the collection wells are simply turned on, proactively controlling gas and resulting odors before odors are detected.

CCL's LFG collection system is addressed by a Title V Permit to Operate issued by SCAQMD. The Title V permit includes specific conditions/mitigation measures with which CCL must comply. Conditions 22 and 23 of the Title V permit address odor from construction of the LFG collection system, and require mitigation measures to be implemented if odors during construction of the LFG system are detected beyond the property line.

## **Minimizing Odors with Beneficial Use Materials**

CCL contracted with Blue Ridge Services to investigate the relationship between the use of beneficial use materials and compliance. A full discussion of the Blue Ridge Report is included in Topical Response #34, Beneficial Use. With regard to odor, the Blue Ridge Report concludes that an increased use of beneficial use material correlates to a decreased number of environmental compliance incidents, including odor. Put differently, the more material a facility diverts from the landfill and uses for beneficial use, the more likely it will be in compliance with Title 27 regulations regarding nuisances, including odor nuisances. One of the most effective solutions to manage odor at a landfill is adequate soil cover (or alternative daily cover). CCL proactively places adequate soil and alternative daily cover on the landfill surfaces, including the active fact, on a frequent basis. In some cases, the active face may be partially or fully covered more than once per day. Additionally, the placement of wood chips and/or green waste mulch on the landfill surfaces may help reduce odor emissions by acting as a bio-filter. Please see Topical Response #34, Beneficial Use, for additional information.

## **Odor Investigation at CCL**

As described in Chapter 11, Air Quality, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, Soil/Water/Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE) conducted an Odor Survey in the spring and summer of 2015 at CCL to characterize and understand the various odors in and around CCL (SWAPE, 2015). The entire SWAPE Report is included in Appendix H-5 of the Final EIR.

Three trained odor specialists conducted odor sampling on 25 separate days, generally between the hours of 6 a.m. and 10 a.m., when odors have been reported to be the most common. Sampling events took place on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays between April 7, 2015, and July 16, 2015. During each sampling event, 50 to 51 locations were sampled, for a total of 3,789 data points.

Locations were selected to give a thorough geographic distribution of sampling points, including potential receptors such as the Val Verde community. Locations were grouped into 14 location groups inside the landfill and offsite in the surrounding communities.

Odors were described using the following methods: dilution to threshold values to quantify the strength, hedonic tone to quantify the pleasantness, odor descriptors to describe the odor, and suspected odor source to describe whether the odor came from the landfill or elsewhere. Analysis of these parameters showed that the landfill working face had the strongest and most unpleasant odors. Offsite, odors were much weaker and were generally neutral in hedonic tone.

Odors were strongest within the landfill property, specifically at or near the working face. The most common odors detected within the landfill were smells of grass, sage, and other plants, the sweet air freshener smell of the odor control system, rotten and sour trash odors, and musty mulch odors. Trash odors were only detected within the landfill at locations other than the working face when weather conditions were hot, with low or calm winds. However, even during these conditions, trash odors were only rarely detected.

Outside the landfill, odors (regardless of source) were often not detected. In fact, 40 percent of offsite sampling data points contained no odors. Trash odors were rarely detected outside the landfill. Some of these detections were determined not to be landfill-related due to confounding sources of odor, and others were too faint to detect when diluted. Specifically, odors potentially related to the landfill were detected offsite 34 times out of 2,025 offsite sampling data points, or 1.68 percent of the time. The SWAPE Report concludes that because of the small detection rate of landfill-related odors offsite, the landfill does not create significant odor impacts to the surrounding communities (SWAPE, 2015).

#### **Odor and Elevation**

The potential for increased odors as a result of increased landfill elevation was addressed in the revised air quality chapter of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. The discussion under Impact AQ-8 states the following:

...the Proposed Project would include both a horizontal and vertical expansion of the existing footprint of the landfill. A horizontal extension of the waste footprint would not be expected to result in increased odors because the working face would continue to be covered at least daily. Similarly, while it might seem that a vertical extension of the waste footprint would result in increased odors for nearby receptors, the opposite typically would occur. When the terrain surrounding a landfill is at a higher elevation than the odor sources, as is the case at CCL, larger impacts are seen right at the project boundary, as potential odor plumes do not have the time or buoyancy to elevate before reaching receptors. And as the elevation of the potential odor source increases, potential odor plumes are likely to be found further downwind, which provides more time for odors to disperse in the ambient air, leading to reduced impacts.

#### **Compliance Related to Odor**

To address potential odor impacts, a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan, including the mitigation measure to implement an Odor Impact Minimization Plan for the mixed organics process/composting facility, will be implemented and enforced by the lead agency, the Los Angeles

County Department of Regional Planning, as part of the Conditional Use Permit. The lead agency is responsible to work with the SCAQMD to manage and enforce odor control and mitigation measures.

#### Odor Control at Sunshine Canyon Landfill versus CCL

It is well known that Sunshine Canyon Landfill (Sunshine Canyon) has been experiencing odor issues and that a variety of odor management strategies have been implemented at Sunshine Canyon, with varying degrees of success.

Between 2011 and the First Quarter of 2016, Sunshine Canyon received 156 NOVs for creating a public nuisance related to odor. For that same period of time, CCL received 1 NOV, related to a particularly odorous load of green waste.

As described above, and in Chapter 11, Air Quality, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, odors may be the result of either aerobic or anaerobic decomposition of wastes. Site characteristics, such as geography; site infrastructure; and site management all factor into whether odors are noticeable outside the facility boundary and may result in a public nuisance. As a result, odor management is site-specific, and what is needed or effective at one site may not be needed or effective at another. For this reason, implementing odor strategies from Sunshine Canyon without consideration of site-specific conditions, is not necessary or appropriate for CCL.

The Blue Ridge Services Report, discussed above and in Topical Response #34, Beneficial Use, documents a positive correlation between increased tons of beneficial use material and reduced compliance issues. Similarly, the use of less beneficial use material correlates to a higher level of compliance issues. It should be noted that while CCL does not currently have a limit on the amount of beneficial use material it can use onsite, Sunshine Canyon is permitted to receive the lowest amount of beneficial use material of the Los Angeles County landfills evaluated.

#### **Odorous Load Training Program**

In response to the NOV that CCL received in 2014 for an odorous load of green waste material, SCAQMD required that CCL develop and implement an Odorous Load Training Program, which SCAQMD reviewed and approved.

The Odorous Load Training Program, which has been added to the Final EIR as Appendix K, describes procedures for odorous load acceptance, odorous load training activities, CCL procedures for odorous waste loads, and training certification forms.

In response to this single NOV, and since implementation of the Odorous Load Training Program, CCL has demonstrated that it can respond quickly to odor issues, and successfully mitigate offsite odor migration.

#### **Odor Impact Minimization Plan**

In response to comments received on the Draft EIR by SCAQMD and others that request that the Proposed Project have mechanisms in place to quickly address odor complaints and issues, CCL will develop an Odor Impact Minimization Plan (OIMP) for landfill operation. The OIMP will describe an odor monitoring protocol, a description of meteorological conditions that affect migration of odors, a complaint response protocol, a description of design considerations for minimizing odors, and a description of operating procedures for minimizing odors. Development and implementation of an OIMP for landfill operation has been added to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the Proposed Project, included in Volume 2 of the Final EIR.

## **Odors and Connection to Public Health**

Detection of odors and responses to them can vary substantially between individuals. While odors can be a community nuisance, and the detection of odors can be an indication of uncontrolled gaseous emissions from landfill operations, odors generally are not a reliable indicator of potential exposures or health risks from substances in air.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

# 34. Beneficial Use

# **Comment Summary**

Comments were received requesting clarification regarding beneficial use materials – what they are and how they are used at Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL).

# Response

Three types of material are received at CCL: waste for disposal, beneficial use material, and soil (clean and contaminated).

Waste for disposal, commonly referred to as garbage or trash (also: "waste material" or "waste disposed" in various CCL permits) consists of nonhazardous solid wastes, as defined in CCL's Solid Waste Facility Permit issued by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) and the Waste Discharge Requirements issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), which are disposed of through the landfill process at CCL. Waste for disposal is considered by both CalRecycle and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works as waste materials that are included when calculating tons of waste disposed against CCL's permit limit (currently 6,000 tons per day and 30,000 tons per week; proposed 12,000 tons per day and 60,000 tons per week).

Beneficial use material consists of all material (with the exception of soils) diverted from disposal that is used beneficially onsite. Beneficial use materials may include concrete/asphalt, asphalt grindings, processed construction and demolition material, treated auto shredder waste, shredded tires, shredded green waste, and materials recovery facility/construction and demolition fines.

Soil consists of both clean soil and contaminated soil.

Clean soil is not a waste material, nor is it a material diverted from the waste stream. Clean soil is not regulated as a waste by the RWQCB. Because clean soil is not a waste material, it is not diverted from disposal, nor can it be considered a beneficial use material. Clean soil is in a category all by itself.

Contaminated soil, pursuant to Section 13263(a) of the California Water Code, is a waste material that requires regulation by the RWQCB. Depending on what happens to contaminated soil at the site, it may be disposed (and consequently counted as waste disposed), or it may be used beneficially. If contaminated soil is used beneficially at CCL, it is considered diverted from disposal, in that it is not included in CCL's waste tonnage disposal limits, but it is not classified as a beneficial use material.

The subsections below provide an overview of the regulatory definition of beneficial use, beneficial reuse at CCL (materials types and uses), environmental benefits of beneficial reuse, and compliance benefits of beneficial reuse. For the purposes of this Topical Response, the terms "beneficial use" and "beneficial reuse" mean the same thing and are used interchangeably.

## Beneficial Use, Defined

Beneficial use at landfills is regulated through Title 27 CCR, Section 20686, as shown below:
#### Section 20686. Beneficial Reuse

Beneficial reuse of solid wastes at a solid waste landfill shall include, but not be limited to, the following: alternative daily cover, alternative intermediate cover, final cover foundation layer, liner operations layer, leachate and landfill gas collection system, construction fill, road base, wet weather operations pads and access roads, and soil amendments for erosion control and landscaping. Alternative daily cover reuse shall comply with the requirements of section 20690. Alternative intermediate cover reuse shall comply with the requirements of section 20700. Other beneficial reuse shall comply with the following requirements:

(a) Beneficial reuse shall be restricted to those solid wastes appropriate for the specific use and in accordance with engineering, industry guidelines, or other standard practices specified in the Report of Disposal Site Information as required by section 21600(b)(6).

(b) Beneficial reuse shall be restricted to quantities of solid wastes no more than necessary to meet the minimum requirements of (a). Should the CIWMB determine that an owner or operator violated this standard, the owner or operator shall revise the applicable reports to reflect the overuse as disposal, and pay the required Board of Equalization (BOE) disposal tipping fees for the amount of overuse.

(c) Storage and handling of solid waste and derived materials for beneficial reuse shall be conducted in a manner to protect public health and safety and the environment, and control vectors, fires, odors, and nuisances.

(d) The owner or operator shall maintain a record of beneficial reuse in accordance with Title 14, California Code of Regulations, section 18800 et seq. The records shall be available for inspection by authorized representatives of the EA, the local health agency, and the CIWMB during normal business hours and retained in the operating record near the site or in an alternative location approved by the EA.

# Beneficial Reuse at CCL

Final EIR Section 2.2.3.3, Beneficial Use Material, describes the type and volume of material diverted from disposal and put to beneficial use at CCL. Final EIR Table 2-1, Beneficial Use Materials, Typical Use at CCL, and Largest 1-Day Total of Each Type, identifies the beneficial use material types and typical beneficial use at CCL. Beneficial use materials include concrete/asphalt, asphalt grindings, processed construction and demolition (C&D) material, treated auto shredder waste (TASW), shredded tires, shredded green waste, and materials recovery facility (MRF)/C&D fines. These material types, how they are used at CCL, and the environmental benefits of the use are described below. Additional information can be found in Appendix N, Beneficial Reuse.

#### Concrete/Asphalt

Concrete and asphalt are used at CCL in both a crushed and uncrushed state. If crushed, concrete/ asphalt may be used to build all-weather surfaces onsite, such as roads and tipping pads at the working face. Concrete/asphalt may also be used for landfill gas trench construction. If not crushed, concrete/ asphalt may be used for erosion control and as energy dissipators, such as rip-rap and checkdams.

#### Processed C&D Material

Processed C&D material is used at CCL similarly to concrete and asphalt. Processed C&D material may be used for construction of wet weather pads, road base, roads and ramps, and pipe crossings.

#### TASW

TASW is used at CCL as alternative daily cover (ADC), as it is an allowable use of this material, consistent with Title 27 CCR. Additional information about TASW and use of TASW at CCL can be found in Topical Response #26, Treated Auto Shredder Waste.

#### Shredded Tires

Shredded tires are used at CCL to protect the methane gas pipeline system as trench backfill in construction of the landfill gas system.

#### Shredded Green Waste

Shredded green waste is used at CCL for temporary slope stabilization, erosion control, fugitive dust control, and ADC.

#### MRF/C&D Fines

MRF and C&D fines are used at CCL as an operations layer over the landfill liner during construction, for protection of the methane gas pipeline system as trench backfill, and for well raising, bench transitions, and pipe crossings. MRF and C&D fines may also be used as ADC.

#### **Operational Effects of Beneficial Reuse**

There are significant environmental benefits, in addition to operational and safety benefits, that result from reusing these otherwise waste materials beneficially onsite.

The beneficial aspects of using these materials include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Dust control compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403
- Dust control compliance with Title 14 CCR, Sections 17407.4, Dust Control
- Preventing track-out of mud onto State Route 126 being a good neighbor, dust control, compliance with Rule 403 and Title 14
- Water conservation water use for dust control minimized
- Improved air quality avoided emissions from onsite equipment use, such as water trucks
- Improved air quality reduced landfill gas surface emission control, compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1150.1
- Erosion control compliance with RWQCB Order R4-2011-052
- Nuisance control
- Safety improved driving surfaces for customer access
- Safety improved walking and driving surfaces for employees
- Odor control compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402 and Title 14 CCR, Section 17406.2
- Litter control
- Landfill gas control keeping system components operational thereby minimizing the risk of potential nuisances and Notices of Violation
- Sediment control minimizing sediment entering the onsite storm water basins

#### **Compliance Benefits of Beneficial Use**

Blue Ridge Services prepared a report for CCL on the compliance benefits of beneficial use material at landfills. Blue Ridge Services reviewed the tonnage of beneficial use materials used at Los Angeles County landfills, reviewed the history of compliance violations at Los Angeles County landfills, and correlated tons of beneficial use material to compliance violations. The Blue Ridge Services report is included in Appendix N, Beneficial Use.

The Blue Ridge Services report finds that, as outlined in Title 27 CCR, Section 20686 (Beneficial Reuse), there are twelve uses for waste materials. Eleven of these uses are related to a range of processes and activities at landfills – all of which are part of operating a compliant landfill. Blue Ridge Services considered whether these beneficial uses would "translate into an improved and more compliant operation." To do so, they "looked for a correlation between the quantity of beneficial reuse used, and the number of relevant LEA incidents, including Areas of Concern (AOC) and Notice of Violation (NOV)." Blue Ridge Services considered relevant LEA incidents to be things that beneficial reuse would affect, such as daily cover, litter control, drainage and erosion, odor, etc.

Blue Ridge Services found that for all Los Angeles County landfills reviewed, as the number of beneficial use tons increases, the number of LEA incidents at that site decreases. Inversely, the fewer beneficial use tons used at a landfill, the more likely that site is to have a higher number of LEA incidents. As shown in the Blue Ridge Services report, CCL receives the most tons of beneficial reuse material per LEA incident of any landfill in Los Angeles County (conversely, CCL experiences the fewest LEA incidents per tons of beneficial reuse material).

The Blue Ridge Services report provides additional discussion of how beneficial use materials are appropriately used at CCL currently in support of the following:

- Erosion Control
- Landfill Gas Control
- Odors
- Wet Weather
- Dust Control
- Access Roads

Blue Ridge Services concludes that there is a direct correlation between the receipt and use of beneficial reuse materials in sufficient quantities and improved regulatory compliance.

# CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL ODOR SURVEY REPORT

**Prepared for:** 

Mike Dean Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill 29201 Henry Mayo Drive Castaic, CA 91384

**Prepared by:** 

Soil / Water / Air Protection Enterprise 2656 29th Street, Suite 201 Santa Monica, CA 90405

# November 24, 2015



Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and Litigation Support for the Environment

# CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL ODOR SURVEY REPORT



Odor Sampling Using Nasal Ranger at Chiquita Canyon Landfill, Castaic, CA.



Technical Consultation, Data Analysis and Litigation Support for the Environment



SOIL / WATER / AIR PROTECTION ENTERPRISE 2656 29th Street, Suite 204 Santa Monica, California 90405 Attn: Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D. Tel: (310) 452-5555 Fax: (310) 452-5550 Email: prosenfeld@swape.com

November 24, 2015

Mike Dean Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill 29201 Henry Mayo Drive Castaic, CA 91384

Subject: Report of Chiquita Canyon Landfill Odor Survey

Dear Mr. Dean:

Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise is pleased to present you with the enclosed Chiquita Canyon Landfill Odor Survey Report. If you should have any questions regarding the above, please call me at (310) 795-2335.

Very truly yours,

Paul Rosenfeld

Paul E. Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

SWAPE conducted an Odor Survey at the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, located at 29201 Henry Mayo Dr, Castaic, CA 91384. SWAPE measured the odors in and around the landfill as well as the Val Verde community. The odor survey was conducted over 25 sampling trips with 3 samplers per trip. 51 locations were sampled each time, subject to accessibility. In total, 3,789 data points were collected. Sampling trips occurred in the morning, when, based on the landfill's historical complaint log and typical expected atmospheric conditions, odors are more likely to be detected.

Locations were selected to give a thorough geographic distribution of sampling points, as well as focusing on receptors such as the Val Verde community. Locations were grouped into 14 location groups inside the landfill and offsite in the surrounding community.

Odors were described using the following methods: (1) Dilution to Threshold values to quantify the strength; (2) Hedonic Tone to quantify the pleasantness; (3) Odor Descriptors to describe the odor; and (4) Suspected Odor Source to describe whether the odor came from the landfill or elsewhere. Analysis of these parameters showed that the landfill working face had the strongest and most unpleasant odors. Offsite, odors were much weaker and were generally neutral in hedonic tone.

Few odors were detected outside of the landfill. Landfill related odors were confirmed only once within the Val Verde community, and were detected on a limited number of occasions at other offsite locations. Even within the landfill itself, trash odors were only detected very close to the working face. Because of the very small amount of landfill related odors detected offsite, based on this study, the landfill does not create significant odor impacts to the surrounding community.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1 | Intro              | Introduction |                        |     |  |  |  |
|---|--------------------|--------------|------------------------|-----|--|--|--|
|   | 1.1                | Purp         | pose and Scope         | . 7 |  |  |  |
|   | 1.2                | Qua          | lifications            | . 7 |  |  |  |
|   | 1.3                | Gen          | eral Limitations       | . 8 |  |  |  |
| 2 | Met                | hods         |                        | 9   |  |  |  |
|   | 2.1                | Sam          | pling Locations        | 9   |  |  |  |
|   | 2.2                | Para         | ameters                | 10  |  |  |  |
|   | 2.2.1 Nasal Ranger |              | Nasal Ranger           | 1   |  |  |  |
|   | 2.2.2              | 2            | Hedonic Tone           | 1   |  |  |  |
|   | 2.2.3              | 3            | Odor Descriptors       | 1   |  |  |  |
|   | 2.2.4              | 4            | Suspected Odor Sources | 12  |  |  |  |
|   | 2.3                | Ana          | lysis                  | 12  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Resu               | ults         |                        | 13  |  |  |  |
|   | 3.1                | Sum          | ımary                  | 13  |  |  |  |
|   | 3.2                | Disc         | ussion                 | 16  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Con                | clusic       | on                     | 17  |  |  |  |

## LIST OF TABLES

- Table 2.2.3Odor Descriptors
- Table 3.1aSummary of Sampling Results
- Table 3.1bMinimum, Average, and Maximum of the Average of Three Samplers' Dilution<br/>to Threshold and Hedonic Tone Measurements per Event Over 25 Events

### LIST OF GRAPHS

- Graph 3.1a Box and Whisker Plot of D/T Values for Location Groups
- Graph 3.1b Box and Whisker Plot of Hedonic Tone Values for Location Groups

## LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 2.1 Map of Sampling Locations
- Figure 2.1a Map of Location Groups
- Figure 3.1 Map of Average Dilution to Threshold Values and Hedonic Tone Values
- Figure 3.1alt Map of Average Dilution to Threshold Values and Hedonic Tone Values (labeled)
- Figure 3.1a Map of Average D/T Values
- Figure 3.1b Map of Minimum D/T Values
- Figure 3.1c Map of Maximum D/T Values
- Figure 3.1d Map of Average Hedonic Tone Values
- Figure 3.1e Map of Minimum Hedonic Tone Values
- Figure 3.1f Map of Maximum Hedonic Tone Values

## LIST OF APPENDICES AND ATTACHMENTS

- Appendix A Sampling Location Maps
- Appendix B Description of Sampling Locations
- Appendix C Description of Sampling Events
- Appendix D Pie Charts of Odor Descriptors and Suspected Sources for Location Groups
- Attachment 1 Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Paul Rosenfeld

# **1 INTRODUCTION**

# 1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

SWAPE conducted an Odor Survey at the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, located at 29201 Henry Mayo Dr, Castaic, CA 91384. SWAPE measured the odors in and around the landfill as well as the Val Verde Community and surrounding area. The odor survey was conducted over 25 sampling trips with 3 samplers per trip. 50 to 51 locations were sampled each time, for a total of 3,789 data points. Sampling trips occurred in the morning, when odor complaints were believed to be most common based on the landfill complaint log as well as the tendency for odors to accumulate at night during stable conditions before being blown away from the landfill in the morning when heating causes winds to pick up.

The Nasal Ranger produced by St. Croix Sensory was used to determine the strength of odor. Other parameters were recorded as well. A description of sampling methods and locations and analysis methods is included in **Section 2**. The results of sampling are presented in **Section 3**. Conclusions are presented in **Section 4**. Additional graphs and figures are included at the end of the report.

# **1.2 QUALIFICATIONS**

I received a B.A. in Environmental Studies from the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1991, an M.S. in Environmental Science from the University of California at Berkeley in 1995, and a Ph.D. in Soil Chemistry from the University of Washington in 1999.

I am a founder and principal environmental consulting scientist at SWAPE. In addition to my education, I have extensive experience in evaluating the fate and transport of environmental contaminants, risk and exposure assessment of contaminants released from pollution sources, and monitoring and modeling of pollution sources that may cause impacts on human health and ecological systems. I use my education, experience, knowledge and expertise to conduct field investigations and prepare risk assessments. I have performed investigation and assessment for both governmental and private entities concerning risks to human health and properties due to contamination from pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls, petroleum hydrocarbons, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, dioxins/furans, volatile organics, chlorinated solvents, perchlorate, heavy metals, asbestos, perfluoroctanoic acid, and other hazardous substances.

I have extensive experience as an odor expert. For my Doctorate I evaluated biosolids and related odors, and have modeled odors from area sources. I was retained by Sanimax to evaluate odor in a rendering facility. At Republic Waste Services in St. Louis I was retained by the Attorney General to evaluate odor from a landfill that is smoldering and radioactive. I developed the urban odor wheel and authored papers on its applications.

I obtained much of my experience in evaluating contaminated sites while working for the United States Navy. I served as a Remedial Project Manager for the Navy Base Realignment and Closure ("BRAC") Team, South West Division on Treasure Island, California. While working for BRAC, I managed many sites with environmental contamination concerns, closed a landfill in California on the MCAS Tustin, and evaluated the failure of a test landfill cap in Orote, Guam.

I have taught on the subject of environmental health at the University of California at Los Angeles ("UCLA") for many years. I also regularly attend and speak at professional environmental conferences on various subjects involving environmental contamination and mitigation/remediation.

I have recently co-authored several books concerning environmental contamination and best practices in the chemical industry. These publications include "The Risks of Hazardous Waste" (2011), "Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Agrochemical Industry" (2011), "Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Wood and Paper Industries" (2010), and "Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production and Cleaner Production, Best Practices in The Petroleum Industry" (2009). I have also published extensively on other scientific studies of contaminant fate and transport and treatment technologies.

I have testified at deposition and/or at trial as an expert witness on numerous cases involving environmental contamination and exposure assessment and human health risk assessment associated with chemical emissions and odor exposure. My testimony experience is provided in my Curriculum Vitae.

# **1.3 GENERAL LIMITATIONS**

This Report and all associated opinions are based on documents and information that was reasonably accessible at the time of investigation. Documents and information include CH2MHill's July 2014 Draft Environmental Impact Report and weather data from Weather Underground. This analysis may be updated if additional documents become available.

# 2 METHODS

# 2.1 SAMPLING LOCATIONS

In order to characterize and understand the various odors in and around the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, 51 representative sampling locations were selected for odor sampling. These locations consisted of 24 locations within the landfill boundary and 27 offsite locations in the communities, industrial areas, and roads surrounding the landfill. These locations were further assigned to location groups. Outside of the landfill, location groups are listed and described below:

- Chiquito Canyon
  - 2 locations along Chiquito Canyon Road West of the landfill Rural/Open/Highway setting with lots of dust and tall grass
- South Val Verde Community
  - 9 locations in the South Val Verde community (referred to as "Val Verde South" in figures and tables)
  - Northwest of landfill, South of Taylor Street and a small mountain ridge Residential setting, few yards, dusty
- North Val Verde Community
  - 5 locations in the North Val Verde community (referred to as "Val Verde North" in figures and tables)
  - Northwest of landfill, North of Taylor Street and a small mountain ridge Residential setting, few yards, dusty
- Del Valle
  - 3 locations on Del Valle Road
  - North of landfill
  - Rural/Open/Highway setting with lots of dust and tall grass
- North Community
  - 2 locations in the community to the Northeast of the landfill Modern tract houses, high density, small grass yards
- Industrial Area
  - 2 locations in industrial area, northeast of landfill
  - Industrial buildings and warehouses, wide paved roads
- Southeast Roads

4 locations near post office, Franklin Road, and Wolcott Road East and southeast of landfill Open/Highway/Industrial setting

Within the landfill, location groups include:

• Landfill Entrance

2 locations near entrance of landfill at South end of landfill Paved setting, lots of truck traffic

• South Landfill

3 locations south and southwest of landfill working face Paved and dirt roads, grass, trees, hills

• North Landfill Perimeter

4 locations north of working face, south of mountain range Dirt and gravel roads, chaparral, grass, odor control misters

- Northeast Ridgeline
  - 2 locations on mountain ridges at north end of landfill, overlooking industrial area Dirt roads, chaparral, grass
- East Landfill

4 locations east of working face

- Near mountains, post office and capped landfill sections
- Tall grass, chaparral, dirt and gravel roads
- Southeast Landfill Perimeter

3 locations southeast of working face on perimeter road

- Close to working face, gravel and paved roads, by landfill gas flare
- The Working Face of the Landfill
  - 6 locations on or very near working face of landfill Dirt and gravel roads, dirt fill, mulch

Locations were selected to provide a broad geographic distribution, while emphasizing receptors, such as the Val Verde community. See **Figure 2.1** and **Appendix A** for maps of sampling locations. The locations are discussed in further detail in **Appendix B** 

Odor sampling was conducted on 25 mornings by 3 trained odor specialists. Sampling generally occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 10 a.m. when odors have been reported to be the most common. Sampling events took place on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays between April 7, 2015 and July 16, 2015. Occasionally, spots had to be skipped because they were inaccessible. Sample location 36, "North Landfill Perimeter," was skipped on the first sampling trip because it was blocked by a large truck. Sample location 47, "Green Waste," was skipped on 11 occasions because no green waste was apparent on the landfill during those sampling occasions. In total, 3,789 data points were collected over the entire survey. The sampling events are discussed in detail in **Appendix C**.

# 2.2 PARAMETERS

Four methods were used to describe the odors at each location:

- 1. Dilution to threshold values acquired via use of the Nasal Ranger (St. Croix Sensory, St. Croix Minnesota) ranging from 0 to 60+,
- 2. Hedonic (pleasantness) tone (scale of -10 to +10),
- 3. Modified Urban Odor Wheel (Rosenfeld et al, 2006) descriptors, and
- 4. Suspected Odor Source.

## 2.2.1 NASAL RANGER

The Nasal Ranger is a portable odor measuring device. The Nasal Ranger allows the user to test odorous air using six dilution ratios (60, 30, 15, 7, 4, and 2) which correspond to the dilution to threshold (D/T) measurement. For example, an odor detected at 60 D/T means that the odor in the ambient air is detected at a dilution factor of 60, meaning that one part odorous air is detectable when mixed with 60 parts clean, carbon-filtered air. A higher D/T value indicates a more odorous sample. In some instances there are odors which cannot be detected by the Nasal Ranger, but can be detected by the human nose. For these cases, the D/T level is recorded as <2, and assumed to equal 1 for calculation purposes.

# 2.2.2 HEDONIC TONE

The hedonic tone scale, developed by Hatayama (1999) characterizes the pleasantness of an odor. The scale is subjective with -10 being the worst imaginable smell and +10 being the best possible smell in the opinion of the detector. A zero indicates that no odor was detected.

# 2.2.3 ODOR DESCRIPTORS

A modified urban odor wheel was used to describe the odors. The scent was initially recorded and described by the observer, but for the purposes of analysis was then grouped into an odor descriptor category. These odor descriptor categories were obtained from Dr. Rosenfeld's Urban Odor Wheel (2006)<sup>1</sup>, but were modified slightly to remove categories that were not detected, and to create more precise categories for certain smells. While hundreds of different smells were recorded, they were grouped into 13 descriptor categories shown in **Table 2.2.3** below.

| Number | <b>Descriptor Category</b>   | Example Descriptors  |  |  |  |  |
|--------|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1      | Fragrant/Fruity              | Fruity, Citrus, Floral   |  |  |  |  |
| 2      | Parks and Fields/Nature      | Grass, Hay, Herbal, Tree   |  |  |  |  |
| 3      | Coffee Shop/Pleasant Flavors | Honey, Berry, Roast, Burnt, Vanilla, Banana  |  |  |  |  |
| 4      | Bakery                       | Toasted, Bread, Smokey, Malty, Buttery   |  |  |  |  |
| 5      | Dusty/Earthy                 | Earthy, Dusty, Wet Dirt  |  |  |  |  |
| 6      | Musty/Moldy Compost          | Woody, Musty, Moldy, Mulch, Green Waste  |  |  |  |  |
| 7      | Fecal                        | Fecal, Manure, Sewery  |  |  |  |  |
| 8      | Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic        | Rotten Egg, Rotten Vegetable, Skunk, Garlic, Canned<br>Corn, Cabbage                     |  |  |  |  |
| 9      | Fishy/Ammonia                | Fishy, Urine, Ammonia  |  |  |  |  |
| 10     | Spoiled Food/Decomposition   | Yeasty, Rancid, Sour Milk, Vinegar, Putrid, Decayed,<br>Sour Cheese, Sweaty, Sharp, Sour |  |  |  |  |
| 11     | Auto Exhaust                 | Gasoline, Faint and Sharp, Sweet, Exhaust  |  |  |  |  |
| 12     | Cleaning Solvents            | Nail Polish, Sweet, Solvent, Cleaner, Air Freshener                                      |  |  |  |  |
| 13     | Soapy                        | Soap, Detergent, Shampoo   |  |  |  |  |

### **Table 2.2.3**

**Odor Descriptors** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Suffet, I.H., Rosenfeld, P., The Anatomy of Odor Wheels for Odors of Drinking Water, Wastewater, Compost, and the Urban Environment, 2007, Water Science & Technology, Vol 55 No 5, pp335-334.

# 2.2.4 SUSPECTED ODOR SOURCES

The source of the odor is useful for its characterization. Since a concern in this project is odors emanating from the landfill traveling offsite, it important to clarify whether an offensive odor was caused by the landfill or some other source. Suspected odor sources were assigned to each odor. Four odor sources were used, including:

- 1. "Landfill" (emanating from landfill trash, green waste, or odor control mister systems),
- 2. "Other" (any source that is clearly not the landfill, such as vehicles, grass, or dust),
- 3. "Unknown" (odors that have characteristics similar to those detected in the landfill, but difficult to describe, such as sour smells, or trash or compost smells with another possible source), and
- 4. "None" (when no odor was detected).

# 2.3 ANALYSIS

All sampling data was collected in the field and recorded on paper forms, indicating the time, location, D/T, hedonic tone, descriptors, and comments. Weather observations were recorded as well. Sampling forms were then transcribed to a database and corrected for analysis. Odor descriptor categories and suspected odor sources were added at this stage. This allowed a consistent judgment to be made for all the data.

Various forms of statistical analysis were performed to analyze the data. The average D/T and Hedonic Tone values were calculated by taking the arithmetic mean of the three samplers' results for each location and each day. From this the minimum, average, and maximum of these averages was calculated to compare the relative odor levels of each location. These values are depicted in **Figures 3.1a-f** in the figures section and **Table 3.1b** in the results section.

The average D/T and Hedonic Tone values were calculated for each location group for each day as well, in order to determine the most odorous days. This is depicted in **Table 3.1a** in the results section.

Box and whisker plots were created to compare each location group and demonstrate the odor trends of each area. These are shown in the graphs section as **Graphs 3.1a** and **3.1b**. The "box" is composed of the first and third (25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) and median, which are the ends of the box and the vertical line in the interior of the box, respectively. The ends of the lines or "whiskers" are the minimum and maximum values. Values that are considered to fall out of the range of values, called outliers, are depicted by dots that fall outside of the box-and-whisker plot.

Pie charts were created for each location group to show how often certain odor descriptors were detected in each area. Pie charts were also created depicting the relative frequency of odor sources for each location group to understand what types of odors impact each area. These are depicted in **Appendix D**.

# **3 RESULTS**

# 3.1 SUMMARY

Offsite, the average dilution to threshold value (measurement of odor intensity) for each location group was less than or equal to 1, with the exception of the Industrial area, which averaged 1.2 D/T. The average hedonic tone (measurement of pleasantness from -10 to +10) ranged between -0.2 and 0.6. The most common odor descriptors were "No Odor" and "Parks and Fields/Nature." Between 0 and 3% of odors were suspected to emanate from the Landfill at offsite location groups, with the exception of the lower Chiquito Canyon Road locations, where 9% of odors were suspected to have originated from the landfill. Additionally, between 2% and 9% of odors were from unknown sources. The lowest hedonic tone (worst smell) associated with any odor in the Val Verde community detected was -5 at the Jackson Gate location. This odor was described as fecal and believed to originate from farming or animal related activities on private property behind the gate.

Odors potentially related to the landfill were detected offsite 34 times out of 2,025 offsite sampling data points, or 1.68% of the time. Out of these 34 data points, 17 were detected through the Nasal Ranger, while the remaining were too faint to detect when diluted. 4 of these 17 Nasal Ranger detections occurred at the Livingston/Watertank sampling location (in the Industrial Area location group), where non-landfill, confounding sources of odor were believed to exist. Accordingly, it is believed that those detections were likely not related to the landfill, however for graphical analysis; the suspected source of "landfill" is retained for these detections. Out of the remaining 13 Nasal Ranger detections, 7 detections occurred at the Chiquito Canyon Road sampling locations, 1 occurred on Del Valle Road, and 5 occurred in the Val Verde community. The lowest hedonic tone associated with landfill odors detected with the Nasal Ranger or nose alone in the Val Verde community was -2, recorded 8 times on 2 dates, July 15 and 16, at 4 Val Verde locations.

Within the landfill, the average D/T values ranged from 0.4 to 2.2, with the exception of the working face, where freshly dumped trash is exposed until buried, which averaged 28.9. The average hedonic tone ranged from -1.1 to 0.7, with the exception of the working face, which averaged -4.0. The most common odor descriptors were "Spoiled Food/ Decomposition," "No Odor," and "Parks and Fields/ Nature." Between only 1% and 2% of odors were suspected to originate from the landfill at the East Landfill and Northeast Ridgeline location groups. Between 35% and 49% of odors were attributed to the landfill at the remaining locations within the landfill, except for the working face, where 96% of odors were caused by the landfill. Between 0 and 4% of odors on the landfill came from unknown sources. See **Tables 3.1a-b** and **Figures 3.1a-f** for more detail.

| Landfill or<br>Offsite | Location Group                  | Average<br>D/T | Average<br>Hedonic<br>Tone | Most Common<br>Descriptor      | 2nd Most<br>Common<br>Descriptor | Percent of<br>Odors<br>Attributed to<br>Landfill | Percent of<br>Odors<br>Suspected<br>Unknown<br>Sources |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
|                        | Chiquito Canyon                 | 0.8            | -0.2                       | No Odor                        | Parks and Fields/<br>Nature      | 9%   | 7%   |
|                        | Val Verde South                 | 0.8            | -0.1                       | No Odor                        | Parks and Fields/<br>Nature      | 1%   | 5%   |
| Offsito                | Val Verde North                 | 1.0            | 0.2                        | Parks and Fields/<br>Nature    | No Odor                          | 1%   | 9%   |
| Onane                  | Del Valle                       | 0.7            | -0.2                       | No Odor                        | Parks and Fields/<br>Nature      | 1%   | 5%   |
|                        | North Community                 | 0.9            | 0.6                        | No Odor                        | Fragrant/ Fruity                 | 0%   | 2%   |
|                        | Industrial                      | 1.2            | 0.3                        | No Odor                        | Soapy                            | 3%   | 8%   |
|                        | Southeast Roads                 | 0.6            | 0.2                        | No Odor                        | Parks and Fields/<br>Nature      | 1%   | 5%   |
|                        | Landfill Entrance               | 1.1            | -1.0                       | Spoiled Food/<br>Decomposition | No Odor                          | 49%  | 2%   |
|                        | South Landfill                  | 1.6            | -0.8                       | No Odor                        | Spoiled Food/<br>Decomposition   | 36%  | 4%   |
|                        | Southeast Landfill<br>Perimeter | 2.2            | -1.1                       | No Odor                        | Spoiled Food/<br>Decomposition   | 37%  | 0%   |
| Landfill               | North Landfill Perimeter        | 1.9            | -0.4                       | No Odor                        | Spoiled Food/<br>Decomposition   | 35%  | 0.3%   |
|                        | Northeast Ridgeline             | 1.3            | 0.7                        | Parks and Fields/<br>Nature    | No Odor                          | 2%   | 3%   |
|                        | East Landfill                   | 0.4            | 0.2                        | No Odor                        | Parks and Fields/<br>Nature      | 1%   | 1%   |
|                        | Working Face                    | 28.9           | -4.0                       | Spoiled Food/<br>Decomposition | Musty/ Moldy<br>Compost          | 96%  | 0%   |

## Table 3.1a

#### Summary of Sampling Results

### Table 3.1b

Minimum, Average, and Maximum of the Average of Three Samplers' Dilution to Threshold and Hedonic Tone Measurements per Event Over 25 Events

|        |                        | Lion or                      | Dilution to Threadedd |         |         |              |         |         |
|--------|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|
|        |                        |                              | Dilution to Threshold |         |         | Hedonic Tone |         |         |
| Sampla |                        |                              | Min of                | Average | Max of  | Min of       | Average | Max of  |
| Sample | Location Name          | Location Group               | Average               | Average | Average | Average      | Average | Average |
| Number |                        |                              | D/T                   | D/T     | D/T     | Hedonic      | Hedonic | Hedonic |
| 1      | Chiquito Cyn S         | Chiquito Canyon              | 0.0                   | 0.9     | 5.3     | -2.7         | -0.1    | 2.3     |
| 2      | Fire Center Road       | Chiquito Canyon              | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 7.0     | -2.0         | -0.3    | 0.7     |
| 2      | Entrance to Community  | Val Varda South              | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 1.0     | 1.7          | 0.0     | 2.0     |
| 3      | Lincoln Ave Couth Turn | Val Verde South              | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 1.7     | -1.7         | 0.0     | 2.0     |
| 4      | Lincoln Ave South Turn | Val Verde South              | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 1.0     | -1.3         | 0.1     | 2.0     |
| 5      | Jackson Gate           | Val Verde South              | 0.0                   | 1.9     | 4.3     | -4.0         | -1.8    | 0.3     |
| 6      | Monroe/Lincoln         | Val Verde South              | 0.0                   | 0.8     | 1.7     | -2.0         | 0.1     | 1.7     |
| 7      | Madison/Lincoln        | Val Verde South              | 0.0                   | 0.6     | 1.3     | -2.0         | -0.1    | 2.0     |
| 8      | Taylor/Lincoln         | Val Verde South              | 0.0                   | 0.5     | 1.7     | -1.3         | 0.0     | 1.3     |
| 9      | Harding Lot            | Val Verde South              | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 1.7     | -2.0         | 0.3     | 3.0     |
| 10     | Harding South Turn     | Val Verde South              | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 13      | -2.0         | 0.2     | 17      |
| 11     | Chiquito Cyn/Madison   | Val Verde South              | 0.0                   | 0.6     | 2.0     | -0.3         | 0.4     | 13      |
| 12     | Son Martinez/Lincoln   | Val Verde North              | 0.0                   | 0.0     | 1.7     | 17           | 0.4     | 1.0     |
| 12     | San Wartinez/Enicon    |                              | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 1.7     | -1.7         | -0.1    | 1.0     |
| 13     | Chiquito Cyn/Central   | Val Verde North              | 0.0                   | 1.0     | 4.0     | -0.7         | 0.5     | 2.0     |
| 14     | Central East           | Val Verde North              | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 2.3     | -1.7         | 0.0     | 2.0     |
| 15     | Hunstock/Lincoln       | Val Verde North              | 0.0                   | 1.3     | 4.3     | -1.0         | 0.3     | 2.3     |
| 16     | Cromwell/Hunstock      | Val Verde North              | 0.3                   | 1.3     | 4.0     | -1.3         | 0.6     | 3.7     |
| 17     | Del Valle 1            | Del Valle                    | 0.0                   | 0.6     | 2.7     | -2.3         | -0.2    | 1.3     |
| 18     | Del Valle 2            | Del Valle                    | 0.0                   | 0.6     | 4.3     | -1.0         | 0.1     | 1.0     |
| 19     | Del Valle/Halsev Cvn   | Del Valle                    | 0.0                   | 0.9     | 3.3     | -2.7         | -0.4    | 3.3     |
| 20     | Liverpool Ct           | North Community              | 0.0                   | 1.4     | 7.0     | -0.7         | 1.5     | 6.0     |
| 20     | Bioford Bl             | North Community              | 0.0                   | 0.4     | 2.0     | 2.0          | 0.2     | 1.2     |
| 21     |                        | Industrial                   | 0.0                   | 0.4     | 2.0     | -3.0         | -0.2    | 1.3     |
| 22     | Industry Drive         | Industrial                   | 0.0                   | 1.0     | 2.7     | -2.0         | 0.0     | 1.3     |
| 23     | Livingston/watertank   | Industrial                   | 0.0                   | 1.5     | 5.3     | -3.0         | 0.7     | 4.3     |
| 24     | Post Office            | Southeast Roads              | 0.0                   | 0.9     | 8.7     | -2.0         | 0.2     | 2.0     |
| 25     | Franklin               | Southeast Roads              | 0.0                   | 0.3     | 1.3     | -0.3         | 0.3     | 2.0     |
| 26     | Wolcott Turn           | Southeast Roads              | 0.0                   | 0.5     | 1.7     | -1.0         | 0.2     | 1.0     |
| 27     | Wolcott Light          | Southeast Roads              | 0.0                   | 0.6     | 1.3     | -2.0         | 0.1     | 1.3     |
| 28     | CCLF Entrance          | Landfill Entrance            | 0.0                   | 0.9     | 2.0     | -2.3         | -0.9    | 0.7     |
| 29     | Turnout Tank           | Landfill Entrance            | 0.0                   | 1.4     | 5.3     | -3.3         | -1.0    | 0.3     |
| 30     | White tanks            | South Landfill               | 0.0                   | 1.3     | 5.0     | -4.0         | -1.3    | 0.0     |
| 31     | South Ridgeline Bend   | South Landfill               | 0.0                   | 1.0     | 6.0     | -2.0         | -0.2    | 2.0     |
| 32     | Fire Center Overlook   | South Landfill               | 0.0                   | 2.4     | 17.2    | _1.3         | -1.0    | 1.0     |
| 32     | Parimeter West         | Warking Face                 | 0.0                   | 2.4     | 60.0    | -4.5         | -1.0    | 1.0     |
| 33     | Perimeter west         | working Face                 | 1.3                   | 23.0    | 60.0    | -7.7         | -3.7    | 0.0     |
| 34     | Odor System            | North Landfill Perimeter     | 0.0                   | 5.3     | 50.0    | -5.0         | -1.1    | 1.3     |
| 35     | Perimeter North        | North Landfill Perimeter     | 0.0                   | 0.9     | 6.0     | -3.3         | -0.6    | 1.3     |
| 36     | Perimeter NNE          | North Landfill Perimeter     | 0.0                   | 1.0     | 5.0     | -1.7         | 0.0     | 1.0     |
| 37     | Perimeter Junc. NE     | North Landfill Perimeter     | 0.0                   | 0.5     | 2.0     | -2.3         | 0.2     | 2.3     |
| 38     | Ridgeline North        | Northeast Ridgeline          | 0.0                   | 1.4     | 11.7    | -0.7         | 0.7     | 3.3     |
| 39     | Ridgeline East         | Northeast Ridgeline          | 0.3                   | 1.2     | 3.3     | -1.7         | 0.7     | 2.7     |
| 40     | Pipe Piles             | East Landfill                | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 1.3     | -1.7         | 0.2     | 1.7     |
| 41     | Concrete Berm          | East Landfill                | 0.0                   | 0.4     | 13      | 0.0          | 0.3     | 17      |
| 12     | Post Office Overlook   | East Landfill                | 0.0                   | 0.2     | 1.0     | 0.0          | 0.2     | 17      |
| 42     | Energy Plant           | Southoast Landfill Parimeter | 0.0                   | 0.2     | 2.7     | 0.0          | 0.2     | 0.7     |
| 43     |                        |                              | 0.0                   | 0.7     | 3.7     | -2.1         | -0.3    | 0.7     |
| 44     | Capped Prim. Cyn LF    | East Landfill                | 0.0                   | 0.3     | 1.3     | -1.0         | 0.1     | 1.0     |
| 45     | Condensate             | Southeast Landfill Perimeter | 0.0                   | 5.1     | 50.0    | -6.0         | -2.1    | 0.0     |
| 46     | Lot Near Face          | Southeast Landfill Perimeter | 0.0                   | 1.0     | 7.0     | -3.7         | -0.8    | 0.3     |
| 47     | Green Waste            | Working Face                 | 1.3                   | 36.8    | 60.0    | -7.0         | -4.0    | -1.3    |
| 48     | Face 1                 | Working Face                 | 0.0                   | 27.4    | 60.0    | -7.3         | -4.0    | 0.0     |
| 49     | Face 2                 | Working Face                 | 1.3                   | 22.6    | 60.0    | -7.7         | -3.8    | -1.3    |
| 50     | Face 3                 | Working Face                 | 0.0                   | 33.5    | 60.0    | -6.3         | -4.3    | 0.0     |
| 51     | Face 4                 | Working Face                 | 2.0                   | 32.7    | 60.0    | -9.0         | -4.5    | 0.3     |
|        |                        |                              |                       |         |         |              |         |         |

# 3.2 DISCUSSION

Odors were strongest and most offensive within the landfill property, specifically at or near the working face. The most common odors detected within the landfill were smells of grass, sage, and other plants, the sweet air freshener smell of the odor control system, rotten and sour trash odors, and musty mulch odors. Trash odors were only detected within the landfill at locations other than the working face when weather conditions were hot with low or calm winds. However, even during these conditions, trash odors were only rarely detected.

Outside of the landfill, odors (regardless of source) were often not detected. In fact, 40% of offsite sampling data points contained no odors. Odors detected offsite varied, including bakery, sweet flavoring, floral, and soapy smells as well as omnipresent grass and hay smells. Dust was frequently smelled at many locations where dirt or dust was present. Manure odors were frequently detected near one property in the South Val Verde Community at the Jackson Gate location, which are believed to emanate from a farm or barnyard on private property. Sweet and pleasant flavoring type smells like cherry or berry were sometimes detected near the industrial area and North Val Verde locations. A business in the industrial area is believed to be the source of these odors. This explains some of the higher D/T values and hedonic tones reported. Floral odors were detected at several locations such as Chiquito Canyon Road/Central Ave, Liverpool Court, and Livingston Ave/Watertank. At these locations, flowers were observed and were believed to be the source of strong, pleasant floral odors.

Trash odors were very rarely detected outside of the landfill. Trash odors were occasionally smelled in the North community locations (Picford Place and Liverpool Court), but these only were detected on garbage pickup days (Wednesdays) when trash cans were nearby. Trash odors were also occasionally detected in the industrial area at the Livingston Ave/Watertank location, however these were believed to originate from several large dumpsters in the neighboring building's parking lot. On one occasion, strong trash odors were detected at this location, however no trash odors were found upwind, meaning this was likely a localized odor, rather than one coming down from the north landfill ridgeline.

Landfill odors were detected on lower Chiquito Canyon Road through the Nasal Ranger on 4 sampling trips. These locations were the closest offsite locations to the open face of the landfill. While sour or trash-like odors were occasionally, but rarely detected in the Val Verde community, it is difficult to tell if they came from the Landfill, given the amount of natural sour smells, trash cans, and decaying organic material such as leaves and wood within the community. Landfill sourced odors were clearly identifiable in the community on only one occasion, July 15, 2015. The presence of these odors was surprising to the samplers, since no clear landfill odor had been detected in the Val Verde community during the prior 23 sampling trips. The odors on July 15 were similar in description to those smelled on the landfill, but were lower in intensity. While these odors were unpleasant, they did not last more than a few hours, and were not detected only a few hours later that morning.

Additionally, faint trash odors, believed to have possibly originated from the landfill, were detected in the community at Madison/Lincoln and Harding Lot locations during the sampling trip on July 16, 2015. These trash odors were much fainter and more difficult to describe than those on July 15 and could not definitively be attributed to the landfill like those on the previous day; nevertheless "landfill" is retained as their suspected source for graphical analysis.

# **4 CONCLUSION**

During SWAPE's sampling, very few odors believed to originate from the landfill were detected outside of the landfill boundaries. Landfill related odors were only confirmed once within the Val Verde community. Even within the boundaries of the landfill itself, trash odors were only regularly detected very close to the active working face. Because of the very small amount of landfill related odors detected offsite, it is unlikely that the landfill creates significant odor impacts to the surrounding community.

SWAPE's odor survey supports CH2MHill's conclusion in their 2014 Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Draft Environmental Impact Report that odor impacts from the landfill are less than significant.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> CH2MHill, 2014, Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Draft Environmental Impact Report.

# Graphs





Graph 3.1b



# Figures







## Average Dilution to Threshold Values And Hedonic Tone Values



### NOTES:

 All locations are approximate.
Values were averaged for each sampling event and then averaged over all 25 events.



Project:

Chiquita Canyon Landfill Odor Survey

Title:

Chiquita Canyon Landfill Average Dilution to Threshold Values And Average Hedonic Tone Values

| いていたの | DRAFT | Drawn by:<br>LME | Project No.:<br>835 | Figure: |
|-------|-------|------------------|---------------------|---------|
|       | SWAPE | Approved:        | Date:               | 5.1     |
|       |       | PER              | 07.21.2015          |         |



## Average Dilution to Threshold Values And Hedonic Tone Values















# Appendix A Sampling Location Maps




























# **Appendix B Description of Sampling Locations**

Location 1: Chiquito Canyon South



# Location Description

Sampling location #1 is on the right shoulder of Chiquito Canyon Road at an elevation of approximately 1000 feet and approximately 0.2 miles north of the intersection of Chiquito Canyon Road and Henry Mayo Drive. This road is the main route taken to access the Val Verde community from the South. It is located slightly northwest of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill ("CCLF") entrance and is within approximately 0.45 to 0.55 miles from the open face of the landfill. The location is among open fields with dirt, grass, shrubbery, and trees with surrounding hills and mountains.

#### Odor

Sampling Location #1 generally had odors described as hay, grass, dirt, and earthy. There were four separate occasions, out of twenty-five, where there were odors described as faint, sour, and stale trash believed to have originated from the landfill.

Location 2: Fire Center Road



# Location Description

Sampling location #2 is on the right shoulder of Chiquito Canyon Road approximately 0.85 miles north of the intersection of Chiquito Canyon Road and Henry Mayo Drive and is right across from a fire department training center. Chiquito Canyon Road is the main route taken to access the Val Verde community from the South and is located at an elevation of 1070 feet. It is located slightly northwest of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill ("CCLF") entrance and is within approximately 0.45 to 0.55 miles west of the open face of the landfill. The location is among open fields with dirt, grass, shrubbery, and trees with surrounding hills and mountains.

# Odor

Sampling Location #2 generally had odors described as hay, grass, dirt, and earthy. There were three separate occasions where there were odors detected described as faint, sour, and stale trash believed to have originated from the landfill.

# Location 3: Entrance to Community



# Location Description

Sampling location #3 is on the right shoulder of Chiquito Canyon Road approximately 1.3 miles north of the intersection of Chiquito Canyon Road and Henry Mayo Drive at an elevation of approximately 1130 feet. This location is placed directly before the entrance to the Val Verde community. It is located northwest of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill ("CCLF") entrance and is within approximately 0.55 to 0.65 miles west of the open face of the landfill. The location is among open fields with dirt, grass, shrubbery, and trees with surrounding hills and mountains and residential homes.

#### Odor

# Location 4: Lincoln Avenue South Turn



# Location Description

Sampling location #4 is approximately 0.1 miles from the entrance to the community and is at an elevation of approximately 1120 feet. It is located northwest of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill ("CCLF") entrance and is within approximately 0.55 to 0.65 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill. The location is among open fields of dirt, grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

#### Odor

# Location 5: Jackson Gate



# Location Description

Sampling location #5 is approximately 0.2 miles from the entrance to the community and is at an elevation of approximately 1150 feet. It is located within approximately 0.55 to 0.65 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill. The location houses farm animals of potentially a large variety including roosters that are audible from the sampling point. It is also among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

#### Odor

Sampling location #5 is likely to be the largest confounder in the Val Verde South region, as a manure smell could be detected at almost every single sampling event. There are animals housed near the sampling location, although it is unclear what exact animals are being housed. One of the animals housed could be chickens, as roosters can be heard.

# Location 6: Monroe / Lincoln



#### Location Description

Sampling location #6 is approximately 0.07 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on the corner of the Lincoln Avenue and Monroe Street intersection. It is located within approximately 0.60 to 0.70 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1140 feet. It is also among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

#### <u>Odor</u>

Location 7: Madison Street and Lincoln Avenue



# Location Description

Sampling location #7 is approximately 0.18 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on the corner of the Lincoln Avenue and Madison Street intersection. It is located within approximately 0.70 to 0.80 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1155 feet. It is among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

#### <u>Odor</u>

Location 8: Taylor Street and Lincoln Avenue



# Location Description

Sampling location #8 is the fifth location in the Val Verde community approximately 0.25 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on the corner of the Taylor Street and Lincoln Avenue intersection. It is located within approximately 0.70 to 0.80 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1170 feet. It is also among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

# Odor

Location 9: Harding Lot



# Location Description

Sampling location #9 is approximately 0.21 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is located between Taylor Street and Lincoln Avenue and Wilson St. and Lincoln Avenue on Harding Avenue. It is located within approximately 0.70 to 0.80 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1165 feet. It is among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles. The residential home located by the sampling location has various flowering plants as seen in the figure.

#### Odor

# Location 10: Harding South Turn



#### Location Description

Sampling location #10 is approximately 0.07 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on the corner of Wilson Street and Harding Avenue intersection. It is located within approximately 0.60 to 0.70 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill at an elevation of approximately 1150 feet. It is also among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

#### Odor

Location 11: Chiquito Canyon Road and Madison Street



# Location Description

Sampling location #11 is approximately 0.22 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on the corner of the Chiquito Canyon Road and Madison Street intersection. It is located within approximately 0.75 to 0.85 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill at an elevation of approximately 1150 feet. It is also among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

#### <u>Odor</u>

Sampling Location 12: San Martinez Road and Lincoln Avenue



# Location Description

Sampling location #12 is approximately 0.40 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on the corner of the Lincoln Avenue and San Martinez Road intersection. It is located within approximately 0.95 to 1.05 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill at an elevation of approximately 1185 feet. It is also among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

#### <u>Odor</u>

Sampling Location 13: Chiquito Canyon Road and Central Avenue



# Location Description

Sampling location #13 is approximately 0.45 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on the corner of the Chiquito Canyon Road and Central Avenue intersection. It is located within approximately 1.00 to 1.10 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1190 feet. It is among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles. The sampling location is also next to flowering plants and a small park.

#### Odor

Sampling location #13 is located next to a small park with flowering plants. A floral smell could be detected during numerous sampling events. Other than this, no odors believed to originate from the landfill.

# Sampling Location 14: Central East



# Location Description

Sampling location #14 is approximately 0.38 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on the corner of the Chiquito Canyon Road and Central Avenue intersection. It is located within approximately 0.90 to 1.00 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1250 feet. It is among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles. The sampling location is also next to flowering plants and a small park.

#### Odor

Sampling Location 15: Hunstock Drive and Lincoln Avenue



# Location Description

Sampling location #15 is approximately 0.50 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on the corner of the Chiquito Canyon Road and Central Avenue intersection. It is located approximately 1.00 to 1.10 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1120 feet. It is among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

#### <u>Odor</u>

Sampling Location 16: Cromwell Avenue and Hunstock Street



#### Location Description

Sampling location #16 is approximately 0.53 miles from the Jackson sampling location and is on Windsor Road in between Cromwell Avenue and Hunstock Street. It is located within approximately 0.90 to 1.00 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1280 feet. It is among grass, shrubbery, trees, residential homes and properties, and motor vehicles.

#### Odor

A sweet cherry or strawberry odor could be detected at sampling location #16 during some of the sampling events. This odor is believed to have originated from a factory located nearby. No odors believed to originate from the landfill.

# Sampling Location 17: Del Valle 1



# Location Description

Sampling location #17 is on the right shoulder of Del Valle Road 0.40 miles away from the Hunstock St. and Del Valle Road intersection and approximately 0.78 miles from the Jackson sampling location. This sampling point is located on a route that leads to the Castaic communities and is at an elevation of approximately 1290 feet. It is located within approximately 1.20 to 1.30 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is among large field of dirt, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills and mountains.

#### Odor

# Sampling Location 18: Del Valle 2



# Location Description

Sampling location #18 is on the right shoulder of Del Valle Road 0.80 miles away from the Hunstock St. and Del Valle Road intersection and approximately 0.78 miles from the Jackson sampling location. It is located within approximately 1.20 to 1.30 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1275 feet. It is among large field of dirt, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills and mountains.

#### Odor

Sampling Location 19: Del Valle Road and Halsey Canyon Road



# Location Description

Sampling location #19 is on the Del Valle Road and Hasley Canyon Road intersection and approximately 1.45 miles from the Jackson sampling location. It is located within approximately 1.75 to 1.85 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1200 ft. It is among large field of dirt, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills and mountains.

Odor

A manure odor could be detected at sampling location #19 on various occasions believed to have originated from sampling location #5. Other than this, no odors believed to originate from the landfill.

Sampling Location 20: Liverpool Court



# Location Description

Sampling location #20 is the first of two community sampling locations located northeast of the landfill passing the commercial section of the region as well as Hasley Canyon Road. The location was accessed through the entry point to the community on Hasley Canyon Road and Gibraltar Lane and is at an elevation of approximately 1250 feet. It is located within approximately 1.85 to 1.95 miles northeast of the open face of the landfill and is among grass, trees, flowering plants, residential homes, and motor vehicles.

#### Odor

Honeysuckle plants were located near sampling location #20, resulting in a sweet smell being detected on most sampling events. Other than this, no odors believed to originate from the landfill.

Samplin Location 21: Picford Place



# Location Description

Sampling location #21 is the second of two sampling locations in the community located northeast of the landfill past Hasley Canyon Road and the commercial sections. It is located within approximately 1.95 to 2.05 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1190 feet. It is among residential homes, grass, trees, flowering plants, and motor vehicles.

#### Odor

A sweet trash odor could be detected at five sampling events due to residential trash bins placed outside for collection. Other than this, no odors believed to originate from the landfill.

# Sampling Location 22: Industry Drive



# Location Description

Sampling location #22 is on the sidewalk of Industry Drive 0.8 miles west of the Hasley Canyon Road and Industry Drive intersection and is at an elevation of approximately 1190 feet. The location is within approximately 1.70 to 1.80 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is among commercial buildings, motor vehicles, hills, and large fields of dirt grass, and trees

# <u>Odor</u>

A soapy odor could be detected at sampling location #22, along with a manure odor. The soapy odor's source is unknown, although the manure odor could possibly originate from sampling location #5. A subtle trash smell could be detected at one sampling event, although the source is unknown.
Sampling Location 23: Livingston Avenue Watertank



## Location Description

Sampling location #23 is at the foot of the path leading up to a watertank located on Livingston Avenue 0.7 miles west of the intersection at Livingston Avenue and Harrison Parkway. The location is within approximately 1.00 to 1.10 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is at an elevation of approximately 1250 feet. It is adjacent to and also among commercial buildings, motor vehicles, hills, and large fields of dirt grass, and trees

#### Odor

Various odors could be detected at sampling location #23 including honeysuckle, soap, cherry, bakery, and trash. Trash odor detected at two events was determined to have originated from the landfill. Other odors could have originated from honeysuckle plants and a factory nearby.

## Sampling Location 24: Post Office



#### Location Description

Sampling location #24 is located at the post office mail drop-off on Franklin Parkway within approximately 1.20 to 1.30 miles east of the open face of the landfill. It is at an elevation of approximately 1050 feet and is adjacent to the post office among assorted shrubbery, trees, and motor vehicles.

#### <u>Odor</u>

A bakery smell could be detected at this location during numerous sampling events. At one sampling event, there was a very faint trash odor, although the source is unknown. Other than this, no odors believed to originate from the landfill, nor any unusual smells were detected at this location.

Sampling Location 25: Franklin





## Location Description

Sampling location #25 is approximately 0.25 miles from the post office sampling location at an elevation of approximately 1050 feet. The location is within approximately 1.15 to 1.25 miles southeast of the open face of the landfill and is among large fields of dirt, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills and mountains.

## <u>Odor</u>

Sampling Location 26: Wolcott Turn



## Location Description

Sampling location #26 is approximately 0.50 miles away from the CCLF entrance and right before the intersection of Wolcott Way and Henry Mayo Drive at an elevation of approximately 970 feet. It is located within approximately 0.70 to 0.80 miles southeast of the open face of the landfill and is among large fields of dirt, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills and mountains.

#### Odor

Sampling Location 27: Wolcott Light



Location Description

Sampling location #27 is located at the intersection of Wolcott Way and Henry Mayo Drive at an elevation of approximately 970 feet. The location is within approximately 0.85 to 0.95 miles southeast of the open face of the landfill and is among large fields of dirt, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills, mountains, and motor vehicles.

## Odor

Sampling Location 28: CCLF Entrance



Location Description

Sampling location #28 is at the entrance to the landfill on Henry Mayo Drive at an elevation of approximately 980 feet. It is located within approximately 0.55 to 0.65 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill and is among grass, shrubbery, trees, hills and mountains as well as frequent passing of garbage trucks in and out of the landfill.

#### Odor

A trash odor was detected in instances where garbage trucks were traveling in and out of the landfill entrance. Other than this, No unusual smells were detected at this location.

## Sampling Location 29: Turnout Tank



## Location Description

Sampling location #29 is off to the side adjacent to the sign-in station of the entrance to the landfill. The location is at an elevation of 985 feet and is located within approximately 0.50 to 0.60 miles northwest of the open face of the landfill. It is among grass, shrubbery, trees, hills and mountains as well as numerous garbage trucks and motor vehicles passing in and out of the landfill.

#### Odor

Faint trash odors could be detected from the landfill at numerous sampling events.

Sampling Location 30: White Tanks



## Location Description

Sampling location #30 is at the white tanks at an elevation of 1010 feet. The location is approximately 0.25 miles north of the entrance to the landfill. It is located within approximately 0.30 to 0.40 miles southeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, grass, shrubbery, hills, and mountains.

## <u>Odor</u>

Faint trash odors could be detected during numerous sampling events.

Sampling Location 31: South Ridgeline Bend



## Location Description

Sampling location #31 is located on the south end of the landfill directly west of the landfill entrance. It is on an uphill route heading to the Fire Center Overlook and is at an elevation of 1060 feet. The location is within approximately 0.55 to 0.65 miles slightly southeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, grass, shrubbery, hills, and mountains.

#### Odor

A trash odor could be detected at occasional sampling events. Other than this, no unusual odors were detected at sampling location #31.

Sampling Location 32: Fire Center Overlook



## Location Description

Sampling location #32 overlooks Chiquito Canyon Road and the Fire Department Training Center and is located at an elevation of approximately 1250 feet. The location is within approximately 0.30 to 0.40 miles southwest of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, grass, shrubbery, and trees.

## <u>Odor</u>

Faint trash odors could be detected during numerous sampling events.

Sampling Location 33: Perimeter West



## Location Description

Sampling location #33 is generally located at the bottom of the route descending from the Fire Center Overlook sampling point at an elevation of approximately 1210 feet. This sampling point sometimes varied depending on the location of the working face of the landfill. The location is usually within approximately 0.10 to 0.20 miles northwest, west, or southwest of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, gravel, grass, shrubbery,

#### Odor

Trash odors could be detected during numerous sampling events.

Sampling Location 34: Odor System



## Location Description

Sampling location #34 is located at an operating machine for the odor system at an elevation of approximately 1325 feet. The location is approximately 0.25 to 0.30 miles north of Perimeter West sampling point and within approximately 0.30 to 0.40 miles north or northwest of the open face of the landfill. It is among large fields of dirt, gravel, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills, mountains, and most importantly the odor system misters.

#### Odor

During events where the odor system was operational, an "air freshener" smell could be detected.

Sampling Location 35: Perimeter North



## Location Description

Sampling location #35 is located along the north perimeter of the landfill approximately 0.20 miles from the odor system sampling point at an elevation of approximately 1310 feet. The location is within approximately 0.35 to 0.45 miles northeast of the open face of the landfill and is among large field of dirt, gravel, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills and mountains.

#### <u>Odor</u>

A faint trash odor could be detected at occasional sampling events

Sampling Location 36: Perimeter NNE



## Location Description

Sampling location #35 is located along the northeast perimeter of the landfill approximately 0.20 miles from the Perimeter North sampling point at an elevation of approximately 1245 feet. The location is within approximately 0.50 to 0.60 miles northeast of the open face of the landfill and is among large fields of dirt, gravel, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills, mountains, and most importantly odor misters.

#### <u>Odor</u>

During events where the odor system was operational, an "air freshener" smell could be detected.

Sampling Location 37: Perimeter Junction NE



## Location Description

Sampling location #37 is located along the northeast perimeter of the landfill and is an entry point to the East Landfill region. It is approximately 0.20 miles from the Perimeter NNE sampling point at an elevation of approximately 1225 feet. The location is within approximately 0.55 to 0.65 miles northeast of the open face of the landfill and is among large fields of dirt, gravel, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills, mountains, and most importantly odor misters.

#### Odor

Other than one sampling event where a faint trash odor could be detected, no unusual smells were detected at this location

Sampling Location 38: Ridgeline North



## Location Description

Sampling location #38 is located along the northeast ridgeline of the landfill at an elevation of 1350 feet and overlooks the commercial region northeast of the landfill. It is within approximately 0.95 to 1.05 miles northeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, grass, shrubbery, hills, and mountains.

## <u>Odor</u>

Other than three sampling events where a cherry odor could be detected, no other unusual smells were detected at this location.

Sampling Location 39: Ridgeline East



## Location Description

Sampling location #39 is the east-most sampling location along the northeast ridgeline of the landfill at an elevation of 1330 feet and overlooks the commercial region northeast of the landfill and the post office. It is within approximately 1.10 to 1.20 miles northeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, grass, shrubbery, hills, and mountains.

#### <u>Odor</u>

Sampling Location 40: Pipe Piles



## Location Description

Sampling location #40 is located by a pile of pipes in the East Landfill section at an elevation of 1110 feet. It is within approximately 0.70 to 0.80 miles northeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills, and mountains.

## <u>Odor</u>

Sampling Location 41: Concrete Berm



## Location Description

Sampling location #41 is located in the East Landfill region and is adjacent to the western border of the post office landfill at an elevation of 1100 feet. It is within approximately 0.90 to 1.00 miles northeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, grass, shrubbery, hills, mountains, and motor vehicles.

## <u>Odor</u>

A bakery odor could be detected at two sampling events. Other than this, no unusual smells were detected at sampling location #41.

Sampling Location 42: Post Office Overlook



## Location Description

Sampling location #42 is located in the East Landfill region and directly overlooks the post office at an elevation of 1225 feet. It is within approximately 0.75 to 0.85 miles east or slightly northeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills, and mountains.

#### <u>Odor</u>

Sampling Location 43: Energy Plant



## Location Description

Sampling location #43 is located in the Southeast Landfill Perimeter region and is adjacent to the energy plant at an elevation of 1200 feet. It is within approximately 0.45 to 0.55 miles east of the open face of the landfill and is among gravel and dirt roads, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills, mountains, and occasional motor vehicles.

#### <u>Odor</u>

Other than two sampling events where a faint trash odor could be detected, no unusual smells were detected at this location.

Sampling Location 44: Capped Prim. Cyn Landfill



## Location Description

Sampling location #44 is located in the East Landfill region and is adjacent to the energy plant at an elevation of 1200 feet. It is within approximately 0.55 to 0.65 miles slightly southeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, gravel, grass, shrubbery, trees, hills, and mountains

## <u>Odor</u>

## Sampling Location 45: Condensate



## Location Description

Sampling location #45 is located in the Southeast Landfill Perimeter region at an elevation of approximately 1150 feet and is adjacent to the facility that extracts condensate. It is within approximately 0.35 to 0.45 miles slightly southeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, gravel, grass, shrubbery, hills, and mountains.

#### <u>Odor</u>

A trash and condensate odor could be detected at almost every sampling event.

Sampling Location 46: Lot Near Face



## Location Description

Sampling location #46 is located in the Southeast Landfill Perimeter region at an elevation of approximately 1160 feet and is at the entry points to the working and open faces of the landfill. It is within approximately 0.30 to 0.40 miles slightly southeast of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, gravel, and motor vehicles.

#### <u>Odor</u>

A mulch odor could be detected at four sampling events along with a faint trash odor at five sampling events. Other than these two instances, no unusual smells were detected at sampling location #46.

Sampling Location 47: Green Waste



#### Location Description

Sampling location #47 is located at any instances where there is fresh green waste, usually near the working face of the landfill at an elevation of approximately 1170 feet to 1200 feet. Green waste was not present at every sampling event. The location is usually right adjacent to or within approximately 0.05 miles of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, gravel, motor vehicles, and trash.

#### Odor

Mulch was present fourteen times out of twenty-five sampling trips. Odors detected during these events included mulch and sweet trash.

Sampling Location 48 through 51: Faces 1 through 4













## Location Description

Sampling locations #48 through #51 are located at various points around the working face of the landfill at elevations of approximately 1040 feet to 1180 feet. The points vary since the working face frequently changes. The four locations are carefully chosen to cover the entire perimeter of the working face of the landfill and are usually placed right adjacent to or within approximately 0.05 miles of the open face of the landfill and is among dirt, gravel, motor vehicles, and trash.

## <u>Odor</u>

Odors described as sharp, strong, pungent, rancid, sweet, sour, trash, etc. were detected during all sampling events.

# Appendix C Description of Sampling Events and Weather Data

# Sampling Event 1 – April 7, 2015

SWAPE first sampled around the Val Verde Community and Landfill on Wednesday, April 8th, 2015, between approximately 6:00 and 9:48 AM. Skies were mostly cloudy and temperatures ranged between about 41 to 54 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 91% at the start of sampling, to 64% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 29.93 and 29.98 inches. Winds were light, and originated from variable directions.

Throughout all locations, Parks and Fields/Nature were most common, followed by Spoiled Food/Decomposition and ND. Most Parks and Fields/Nature observations were recorded offsite with descriptors that mostly included 'grass', 'fresh', 'hay', 'greenery', 'nature', and more. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, over three-quarters were recorded on the landfill. Of the offsite observations, none were recorded within the Val Verde Community. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash', 'sharp', 'rotten', 'garbage', and more. Over one-half of NDs were recorded on the Landfill.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND to 15. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -4 at Jackson Gate, up to 5 at the Post Office, Industry Drive, and Livingston/Watertank. Jackson Gate had a D/T of <2, within the Fecal and Parks and Fields/Nature Categories. The Post Office had D/Ts of 4, 7, and 15 within the Bakery Category. Industry Drive had D/Ts of ND, <2, and 7 within the ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, and Soapy Categories. Livingston/Watertank had D/Ts of <2, 2, and 7 within the Coffee Shop/Pleasant Flavors, Soapy, and Cleaning Solvents Categories. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 15 at the Post Office, with a hedonic tone of -2 and descriptors of 'cooked lamb'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 1.9 and 0.5, respectively.

On the landfill, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over one-half of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -9 to 4, with the most negative (-4 to -9) being observed mostly around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between 4 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Fecal, and Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, with descriptors such as 'trash', 'landfill', 'sweet trash', 'rotten', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -2 and -9. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, ND, Fragrant/Fruity, Dusty/Earthy, Coffee Shop/Pleasant Flavors, Cleaning Solvents, and Auto Exhaust Categories. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 30 at the Condensate Tank with descriptors including 'trash', 'landfill', and 'sweet'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 13.2 and -2.3, respectively.

Weather History Graph April 7, 2015



# Sampling Event 2 – April 8, 2015

The second sampling event on Wednesday, April 8, 2015 took place between approximately 6:00 and 9:48 AM. Skies were mostly clear to partly cloudy, and temperatures ranged between 39 and 55 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 96% at the start of sampling, to 58% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 30.08 and 30.13 inches. Winds were calm to light and originated from variable directions.

Throughout all Locations, descriptors related to Parks and Fields/Nature were detected most, followed by Spoiled Food/Decomposition and ND. More than half of the Parks and Fields/Nature observations were recorded on the Landfill and included descriptors such as 'grass', 'hay', and 'wet grass'. Of all Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, approximately one-half were detected on the Landfill and one-half offsite. Of the offsite observations, approximately half were in the Val Verde Community. The Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors include 'faint trash', 'grass', 'sweet trash', 'mulch', and more. Most NDs were detected offsite.

Offsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 15. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -3 at Jackson Gate, up to 5 at Liverpool Court. Jackson Gate had D/Ts of 2 and 4 with Fecal descriptors such as 'farm', 'manure', and 'poultry'. Liverpool Court had D/Ts of <2 and 2 with Fragrant/Fruity and Soapy descriptors such as 'soap', 'sweet honey', and 'honeysuckle'. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 15 at Fire Center Road with a D/T of 14, descriptors of 'faint trash', and a hedonic tone of -2. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 1.4 and 0.2, respectively.

Onsite, the landfill, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -9 to 2, with the most negative (-4 to -9) being primarily observed around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between <2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Musty/Moldy Compost, and Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, with descriptors such as 'trash', 'mulch', 'rotten', 'sweet', 'grass', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face were described within the Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Nusty/Moldy Compost, Fecal, Soapy, and Auto Exhaust Categories. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 7 at the Lot Near Face. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 9.6 and -1.0, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph April 8, 2015



# Sampling Event 3 – April 9, 2015

The third sampling event on Thursday, April 9th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:10 and 9:58 AM. Skies were \_mostly clear to overcast, and temperatures ranged between about 43 to 54 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 71% at the start of sampling, to 52% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.96 to 30 inches. Winds were light, and originated from the west-northwest, north-northwest, north, and east-northeast.

Descriptors related to Parks and Fields/Nature were most common, followed by Non-Detects, and Fecal. Descriptors categorized as Parks and Fields/Nature were noted in most locations on and off the Landfill. These descriptors include 'clean', 'grass', 'sage', and 'hay'. Most Fecal odors were detected in the Val Verde Community. Roughly one-third of NDs were noted on the Landfill Property.

Offsite, D/T ranged from non-detect (ND) up to 4 throughout the Val Verde community and other areas outside the Landfill. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from negative three at Jackson Gate and Del Valle/Halsey Canyon Locations (Fecal descriptors of manure, chicken poop, and farm) up to positive four at the Liverpool Court and Livingston/Watertank Locations, which were described with 'fresh, soapy, clean' and 'artificial sweetness'. Locations with unpleasant Fecal odors were noted to have D/Ts of <2 and 2. Liverpool Court and Livingston/Watertank had recorded D/Ts between <2 and 4. The highest noted odors were equal to 4 D/T and were recorded at Livingston/Watertank and Hunstock/Lincoln. Livingston/Watertank descriptors fell under Parks and Fields/Nature and Coffee Shop/Pleasant Flavors. Hunstock/Lincoln had a Fecal descriptor, with a hedonic tone of <1. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 1 and 0.3, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. The majority of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 7 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive four to negative eight, with the most negative hedonic tones being noted at or near the Working Face. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between <2 through 60. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described with Dusty/Earthy, Parks and Fields/Nature, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, ND, Auto Exhaust, and Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic. Less than one-fourth of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill were identified to be Landfill waste-related. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 12.5 and -1.1, respectively.
Weather History Graph April 9, 2015



## Sampling Event 4 – April 14, 2015

The fourth sampling event on Tuesday, April 14th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:14 and 9:57AM. Skies were mostly clear to hazy, and temperatures ranged between about 49 to 54 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 98% at the start of sampling, to 74% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 30.07 and 30.09 inches. Winds were light, and originated from the west-southwest, southwest, west, and north-northeast.

Throughout all Locations, Spoiled Food/Decomposition were most common, followed by Parks and Fields/Nature and ND. Approximately two-thirds of all NDs were offsite. Of all Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, over three-quarters were recorded on the Landfill. Of those recorded offsite, none were recorded over a <2 D/T. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors include 'trash', 'sour', 'rotten', 'leachate', and more. Most Parks and Fields/Nature observations were recorded offsite, with descriptors such as 'grass', 'hay', 'sweet', 'spicy', and more.

Offsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 4. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -3 at Jackson Gate, up to 4 at Liverpool Court. Jackson Gate had had Fecal descriptors of 'farm', 'barnyard', 'chicken', and 'manure', with D/Ts of <2 and 4. Liverpool Court had Fragrant/Fruity descriptors of 'sweet', 'flowery', and 'honeysuckle', with D/Ts of 2 and 4. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 4 at Jackson Gate, Liverpool Court, Livingston/Watertank, and Post Office. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.9 and 0.2, respectively.

On the landfill, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. About three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -10 to 3, with the most negative (-4 to -10) being primarily observed around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between <2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy Compost, and Fishy/Ammonia, with descriptors such as 'trash', 'manure', 'pungent', 'rotten', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -1 and -10. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Soapy, Cleaning Solvents, Musty/Moldy Compost, Auto Exhaust, Coffee Shop/Pleasant Flavors, and Dusty/Earthy Categories. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 30 at the Condensate Tank with descriptors of 'trash', 'sharp', 'sweet', and 'leachate'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 10 and -2.0, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph April 14, 2015



# Sampling Event 5 – April 15, 2015

The fifth sampling event on Wednesday, April 15th, 2015, took place between approximately 7:08 and 10:23 AM. Skies were mostly sunny to hazy, and temperatures ranged between about 57 to 65 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 22% at the start of sampling, to 11% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 30.02 and 30.06 inches. Winds were moderate and high from the west-northwest, north-northwest, and north.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Over one-half of all NDs were recorded offsite. Over one-half of Parks and Fields/Nature observations were recorded offsite. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors mostly include 'grass', 'hay', and 'sage'. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, most were recorded on the landfill and none were recorded specifically within the Val Verde Community. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly include 'trash', 'mulch', 'rotten', 'sour', and more.

Offsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 7. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -4 at Chiquito Canyon South, up to 2 at Chiquito Canyon/Central. Chiquito Canyon South had D/Ts of 2 and 7 and had Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors of 'mulch', 'trash', and more. Chiquito Canyon/Central had D/Ts of <2 and had Fragrant/Fruity descriptors of 'flowers' and 'faint roses'. Overall the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 7 at Chiquito Canyon South. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.6 and 0.06, respectively.

On the landfill, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -8 to 4, with the most negative (-4 to -8) being primarily observed around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between 2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy Compost, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, and Fishy/Ammonia, with descriptors such as 'trash', 'rotten egg', 'mulch', and 'sour'. Hedonic tones at the Working Face Ranged between -1 and -8. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy Compost, and Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic Categories. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 7 at Fire Center Overlook and Lot Near Face. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 8.6 and -1.1, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph April 15, 2015



# Sampling Event 6 – April 16, 2015

The sixth sampling event on Thursday, April 16th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:13 and 9:33 AM. Skies were mostly clear and temperatures ranged between 60 and 66 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity maintained at 9% at the start of sampling and when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 30.03 and 30.08 inches. Winds were moderate to strong, and originated from the north-northwest and northwest directions.

Throughout all Location, NDs were most common, followed by Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Approximately three-quarters of the NDs recorded were offsite. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors mostly included 'grass', 'sage', 'hay', and more. Of all Parks and Fields/Nature detected, most were recorded offsite. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, all were detected on the Landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash', 'mulch', 'sweet', 'sour', 'leachate', and more.

Offsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 4. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -3 at Jackson Gate (Fecal descriptors of 'chicken', 'farm', and 'manure'), up to a 3 at Liverpool Court and Livingston/Watertank (Fragrant/Fruity and Bakery descriptors of 'honeysuckle', 'bakery', 'donuts', and 'sweet'). On this sampling trip, Jackson Gate had D/Ts of 2 and 4, Liverpool Court had D/Ts of <2 and 2, and Livingston/Watertank had D/Ts of <2 and 2. The highest noted odors offsite were equal to 4 D/T at Jackson Gate and had Fecal descriptors of 'poultry', 'manure', and 'farm'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.6 and 0.3, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -9 to 4. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between <2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy Compost, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, Dusty/Earthy, and Cleaning Solvents, with descriptors such as 'rotten grass', 'trash', 'mulch', 'sour', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -1 and -9. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Fishy/Ammonia, Musty/Moldy Compost, Dusty/Earthy, Coffee Shop/Pleasant Flavors, and Soapy Categories. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 60 at the Condensate Tank with descriptors of 'rancid/sweet', 'condensate', 'acidic', and 'sour'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 10.1 and -1.1, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph April 16, 2015



# Sampling Event 7 – April 17, 2015

The seventh sampling event on Friday, April 17th, 2015 took place between approximately 6:15 and 9:36 AM. Skies were mostly clear and temperatures ranged between 51 and 62 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 33% at the start of sampling, to 23% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 30.07 and 30.09 inches. Winds were light to moderate and originated from the north-northeast and north directions.

Throughout all Locations, Parks and Fields/Nature were most common, followed by ND and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. More than one-half of the Parks and Fields/Nature recorded were offsite. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors mostly included 'grass', 'sage', 'sour grass', 'sweet grass', and 'hay'. Of all NDs, most were detected on the Landfill. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, all were detected on the Landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash', 'sweet', 'rotten', 'manure', 'sour', and more.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND to 4. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -3 at Jackson Gate, Del Valle/Halsey Canyon, and Industry Drive, up to 3 at Livingston/Watertank and Franklin. Locations with a hedonic tone of -3 had at highest, a D/T of 4 and fell in the Fecal descriptor category. Locations with a hedonic tone of 3 had at highest, a D/T of <2 and fell in the Fragrant/Fruity descriptor category. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 4 at Jackson Gate with a hedonic tone of -3 and descriptors of 'manure', 'hay', and 'farm'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.9 and 0.1, respectively.

On the landfill, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarter of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -9 to 2, with the most negative (-4 to -9) being only observed around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between 2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, Fishy/Ammonia, and Fecal, with descriptors such as 'trash', 'manure', 'rotten', 'sour', 'rancid', 'fishy', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face were described between -1 and -9. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the Spoiled Food/Decomposition, ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, Coffee Shops/Pleasant Flavors, Fragrant/Fruity, Dusty/Earthy, Cleaning Solvents, and Auto Exhaust Categories. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 2 at various locations. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 11.3 and -1.0, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph April 17, 2015



## Sampling Event 8 – April 28, 2015

The eighth sampling event on Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 took place between approximately 6:05 and 9:28 AM. Skies were mostly clear and temperatures ranged between 57 and 72 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 25% at the start of sampling, to 29% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 30 and 30.02 inches. Winds were light and originated from the north-northwest, north, and east-northeast directions.

Throughout all Locations, Parks and Fields/Nature were most common, followed by ND and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. More than one-half of the Parks and Fields/Nature recorded were offsite. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors mostly included 'grass', 'sage', 'sour grass', 'sweet grass', and 'hay'. Of all NDs, most were detected offsite. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, most were detected on the Landfill. Two observations were detected in the Val Verde Community. Spoiled Food Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash', 'sour', 'mulch', and were observed no higher than a D/T of <2 offsite.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND up to 4. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -4 at Jackson Gate and Del Valle/Halsey Canyon, up to 3 at Liverpool Court. Jackson Gate and Del Valle/Halsey Canyon had D/Ts of 2 and 4 with descriptors of 'farm animal' and 'manure'. Odor at Liverpool Court was described as 'floral' and had D/Ts of <2. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 9.5 and -1.1, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -7 to 3, with the most negative (-4 to -7) being primarily around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between 2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy Compost, and Fishy/Ammonia, with descriptors such as 'trash', 'mulch', 'seafood', 'rotten egg', 'sour trash', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -1 and -7. No Green Waste was apparent at this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Dusty/Earthy, Parks and Fields/Nature, Soapy, Musty/Moldy Compost, Coffee Shop/Pleasant Flavors, Bakery, Cleaning Solvents, and Auto Exhaust. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 7 at the Fire Center Overlook with descriptors including 'trash' and 'sweet'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.8 and -0.3, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph April 28, 2015



#### Sampling Event 9 – April 29, 2015

The ninth sampling event on Wednesday April 29th, 2015 took place between approximately 6:11 and 9:38 AM. Skies were mostly clear and temperatures ranged between 63 and 75 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 28% at the start of sampling, to 21% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 29.91 and 29.98 inches. Winds were light and originated from the north and north-northeast directions.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Over one-half of NDs were recorded offsite. Of the offsite NDs, over half were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors mostly included 'grass', 'hay', 'sweet', 'sour', and more. Over half of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were detected offsite. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, all were recorded on the Landfill and none in the Community. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash', 'sour', 'leachate', 'rotten egg', and more.

Offsite, D/Ts ranged from ND up to 7. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -5 at Jackson Gate, up to 3 at the Post Office. Jackson Gate was noted to have Fecal descriptors of 'farm animals', 'manure', and 'poultry' with D/Ts of 2, 4, and 7. The Post Office was noted to have Bakery descriptors of 'pretzel', 'sweet', and 'bakery', with D/Ts of <2 and 4. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 7 D/T at Jackson Gate (hedonic tone of -4) with descriptors of 'farm', 'manure', and 'poultry'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.9 and -0.2, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. About three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -7 to 2, with the most negative (-4 to -7) primarily being around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between 4 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy Compost, and Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, with descriptors such as 'trash', 'sour', 'rotten', 'rotten egg', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -3 and -7. No Green Waste was apparent at this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the Spoiled Food/Decomposition, ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, Cleaning Solvents, and Bakery Categories. The highest D/T recorded at places other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 2 at various locations. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 6.3 and -1.5, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph April 29, 2015



### Sampling Event 10 – May 12, 2015

The tenth sampling event on Tuesday May 12th, 2015 took place between approximately 6:15 and 9:40 AM. Skies were mostly clear and temperatures ranged between 51 and 63 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 93% at the start of sampling, to 54% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 29.82 and 29.89 inches. Winds were light and originated from the north-northwest, east-northeast, west, north-northeast, and northeast directions.

Throughout all Locations, Parks and Fields/Nature were most common, followed by NDs and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Over one-half of the Parks and Fields/Nature observations were recorded offsite, and half of those in the Val Verde Community. Descriptors associated with Parks and Fields/Nature included 'hay, 'grass', and 'sage'. Over one-half of all NDs were observed offsite. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, most were recorded on the landfill. Of the offsite odors, none were detected in the Val Verde Community. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash', 'leachate', 'sour trash', 'sweet trash', and more.

Offsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 7. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -4 at Jackson Gate and Livingston/Watertank, up to 4 at Hunstock/Lincoln. Jackson Gate had Fecal descriptors of 'farm', 'manure', and 'hay' with D/Ts of 2, 4, and 7. Livingston/Watertank had Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors of 'sour trash', 'leachate', and 'sage' with D/Ts of 2 and 4. Hunstock/Lincoln had D/Ts of <2, 2, and 7 with a descriptors of 'floral', 'wet grass', and 'hay'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 1.2 and -0.2, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -7 to 3, with the most negative (-4 to -7) primarily being around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between <2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition and Musty/Moldy Compost, with descriptors including 'trash', 'leachate', 'sour', 'mulch', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -1 and -7. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the Spoiled Food/Decomposition, ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, Musty/Moldy Compost, Bakery, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, Cleaning Solvents, and Auto Exhaust Categories. The highest D/T recorded at locations other than those at or near the working face was equal to 7 at the Odor System and Condensate Tanks with descriptors of 'trash' and 'leachate', respectively. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 4.3 and -1.1, respectively.

Weather History Graph May 12, 2015



## Sampling Event 11 – May 13, 2015

The eleventh sampling event on Wednesday May 13, 2015 took place between approximately 6:18 and 9:52 AM. Skies were mostly clear to overcast, and temperatures ranged between 49 and 57 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 86% at the start of sampling, to 65% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 29.93 and 30 inches. Winds were light to moderate and originated from the east-northeast, east-southeast, and southeast directions.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by Parks and Fields/Nature and Dusty/Earthy. Over half of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, almost one-half were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors mostly included 'hay', 'grass', 'sage', and 'wet grass'. Over half of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were detected offsite. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, over one-half were recorded on the landfill. None of the offsite Spoiled Food/Decomposition observations were detected in the Val Verde Community. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash' and 'sour', and were observed at no higher than a D/T of 4 offsite.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND up to 4. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -3 at Pickford Place and Livingston/Watertank, up to 3 at Hunstock/Lincoln. Pickford Place was noted to have descriptors of 'trash' and 'wet grass', with D/Ts of 2 . Livingston/Watertank was noted to have descriptors of 'trash' and 'sour trash', with D/Ts of 2 and 4. Odor at Hunstock/Lincoln was described as 'floral' and 'honeysuckle', and had D/Ts of 2. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 4 D/T at Livingston/Watertank. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.7 and 0.1, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -8 to 3, with the most negative (-4 to -8) being only observed around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at or near the Working Face ranged between <2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy Compost, Cleaning Solvents, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic/ and Fishy/Ammonia, with descriptors such as 'trash', 'mulch', 'rotten', 'seafood', 'sweet', 'air freshener', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -1 and -8. No Green Waste was apparent at this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Fecal, Dusty/Earthy, Auto Exhaust, and Cleaning Solvents Categories. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 2 at various locations. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 8.2 and -0.8, respectively.

Weather History Graph May 13, 2015



## Sampling Event 12 – May 14, 2015

The twelfth sampling event on Thursday May 14, 2015 took place between approximately 6:17 and 9:54 AM. Skies were partly cloudy with some showers, and temperatures ranged between 50 and 58 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 79% at the start of sampling, to 62% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 29.89 and 29.93 inches. Winds were light and originated from the north, south-southeast, and west-northwest directions.

Throughout all locations, NDs were most common, followed by Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Over one-half of NDs were recorded offsite. Of those, almost one-third were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors mostly included 'hay', 'sage', and 'grass'. Approximately one-half of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were detected offsite, and one-half on the Landfill. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, most were recorded on the landfill. Two observations were detected in the Val Verde Community at Harding South Turn, but the suspected source is something other than the landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash', 'leachate', 'sour', and more, and were observed at no higher than a D/T of 2 offsite.

Offsite, D/Ts ranged from ND up to 2. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -3 at Lincoln Avenue South Turn, Jackson Gate, and Livingston/Watertank, up to 2 at Monroe/Lincoln and Taylor/Lincoln. Locations with a hedonic tone of -3 had D/Ts of <2 and 2. Locations with a hedonic tone of 2 had D/Ts of <2 and 2. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 2 D/T at various locations. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.6 and -0.1, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -6 to 2, with the most negative (-4 to -6) being only observed around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at and near the Working Face ranged between <2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food Decomposition, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, Musty/Moldy Compost, and Dusty/Earthy. These descriptors included terms such as 'trash', 'mulch', 'rotten egg', 'sour' and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -1 and -6. No Green Waste was apparent at this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Dusty Earth, and Cleaning Solvents Categories. The highest D/T recorded at locations other than the at or near the Working Face was equal to 7 at Perimeter NNE with a descriptor of 'air freshener'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 4.9 and -1, respectively.

Weather History Graph May 14, 2015



### Sampling Event 13 – May 20, 2015

The thirteenth sampling event on Wednesday May 20th, 2015 took place between approximately 6:10 and 9:25 AM. Skies were partly cloudy and temperatures ranged between 51 and 65 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 85% at the start of sampling, to 56% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures were maintained at 29.98 inches. Winds were light and originated from the east-northeast and the south-southwest directions.

Throughout all locations, NDs were most common, followed by Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Approximately one-half of the NDs were recorded offsite, and one-half onsite. Of those NDs recorded offsite, over one-half were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors mostly included 'grass', 'hay', 'sweet', 'sour', and 'wet grass'. Over three-quarters of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were detected offsite, and of those, over half were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, almost all were recorded on the landfill. None were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash', 'sweet', 'sharp', and more.

Offsite, D/Ts ranged from ND up to 2. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -4 at Jackson Gate, up to 4 at Cromwell/Hunstock. Jackson Gate had D/Ts of 2 with descriptors of 'manure', 'trash', and 'seafood'. Cromwell/Hunstock had D/Ts of <2 and 2 with descriptors of 'sweet', 'maple', 'berries', and 'hay'. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 2 D/T at various locations. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.6 and 0.08, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. About three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from -6 to 2, with the most negative (-4 to -6) being only observed around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at and near the Working Face ranged between <2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Fishy/Ammonia, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, and Fecal. These descriptors included terms such as 'trash', 'seafood', 'rotten egg', 'sweet', 'manure', and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -1 and -6. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Fishy/Ammonia, Cleaning Solvents, Dusty/Earthy, and Auto Exhaust Categories. The highest D/T recorded at locations other than at or near the Working Face was equal to 15 at the Fire Center Overlook with descriptors of 'trash', 'leachate', and 'sweet/rancid'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 5.4 and -0.7, respectively.

Weather History Graph May 20, 2015



## Sampling Event 14 – May 21, 2015

The fourteenth sampling event on Thursday May 21st, 2015 took place between approximately 6:31 and 10:10 AM. Skies were mostly cloudy to overcast, and temperatures ranged between 52 and 61 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 86% at the start of sampling, to 62% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressures ranged between 29.96 and 29.98 inches. Winds were light and originated from the southwest, south-southeast, and east directions.

Throughout all locations, NDs were most common, followed by Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Over one-half of the NDs were recorded offsite. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors mostly included 'wet hay', 'wet grass', and 'sage'. Over half of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were detected offsite, and about half were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Of the Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, all were recorded on the landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors mostly included 'trash', 'rancid', 'rotten egg', 'mulch', and more.

Offsite, D/Ts ranged from ND up to 2. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from -3 at Jackson Gate, up to 2 at Industry Drive and Lincoln Avenue South Turn. Jackson Gate had D/Ts of <2 and 2 with descriptors of 'manure', 'farm', and 'wet hay'. Industry Drive had D/Ts of <2 and 2 with descriptors of 'fresh cut grass' and 'sweet grass'. Lincoln Avenue South Turn had D/Ts of ND, <2, and 2 with descriptors of 'wet grass' and 'hay'. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 2 D/T at various locations. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.54 and 0.03, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarter of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged -8 to 2, with the most negative (-5 to -8) being only observed around the Working Face Locations. D/Ts at and near the Working Face ranged between <2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy Compost, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, and Cleaning Solvents. These descriptors included terms such as 'trash', 'rotten egg', 'mulch', 'air freshener' and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -1 and -8. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Musty/Moldy, Dusty/Earthy, Cleaning Solvents, and Auto Exhaust Categories. The highest D/T recorded at locations other than at or near the Working Face was equal to 7 at the Turnout Tank with descriptors of 'trash' and 'sesame'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 6.11 and -1.2, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph May 21, 2015



## Sampling Event 15 – May 28, 2015

Sampling on Thursday, May 28th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:17 and 9:28 AM. Skies mostly clear and temperatures ranged between about 53 to 68 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 93% at the start of sampling, to 57% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.98 to 30 inches. Winds were light, and originated from the north-northwest, north, southeast and east-southeast.

Throughout the Landfill and offsite sampling locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite included 'hay', 'grass', and 'sweet'. Approximately two-thirds of all NDs were recorded offsite. Roughly one-half of offsite NDs were recorded in the Val Verde Community.

Offsite, D/T ranged from non-detect (ND) up to 2. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from negative one at the Wolcott Light, Monroe/Lincoln, Central East, Hunstock/Lincoln, and Del Valle 1 Locations, up to positive six at Livingston/Watertank. Locations with hedonic tones of -1 had recorded descriptors of 'dust', 'fruity', and 'exhaust'. Odor at Livingston/Watertank was described as 'sweet, sugary, bakery', 'marshmallow', and 'berries, sweet creme'. Locations with unpleasant odors with -1 hedonic tones were noted to have D/Ts of <2. Overall, the highest noted odor was equal to 2 D/T at Livingston/Watertank. This Location was the only Location to have a recorded D/T of 2, whereas all other offsite observations were either <2 or ND. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.44 and 0.34, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive two to negative seven, with the most negative hedonic tones (-6 and -7) being noted at the Working Face and Green Waste. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between <2 through 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Must/Moldy Compost, Fishy/Ammonia, and Spoiled Food/Decomposition with descriptors such as 'very sweet, mulch', 'rotten trash, seafood, landfill', and 'trash, mulch, sour'. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Auto Exhaust, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Cleaning Solvents, Dusty/Earthy, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic Categories. Over one-third of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill were identified to be ND. Approximately two thirds of detected odors onsite were attributed to Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 7 at the Energy Plant and Turnout Tank Locations (hedonic tones of -5 and -4, respectively). The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 5.43 and -1.0, respectively.

Weather History Graph May 28, 2015



### Sampling Event 16 – June 3, 2015

Sampling on Wednesday, June 3rd, 2015, took place between approximately 6:10 and 9:37 AM. Skies were mostly cloudy and temperatures ranged between about 53 to 62 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 94% at the start of sampling, to 75% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.95 to 29.96 inches. Winds were light, and originated from the south-southwest, west-southwest, southwest, and northwest.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Spoiled Food/Decomposition and Parks and Fields/Nature. One-third of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property and two-thirds of all recorded NDs were located offsite. Of the offsite NDs, more than one-half were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Less than one-fourth of Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations were recorded offsite. These odors were detected at Pickford Place and Post Office, with D/Ts of <2 or 2. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite included 'hay', 'grass', and 'wet hay'. More than one-half of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded on the Landfill Property.

Offsite, D/T ranged from non-detect (ND) up to 2. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from negative four at Pickford Place, up to positive three at Cromwell/Hunstock. A single descriptor of 'trash' was recorded at Pickford Place with D/Ts of <2 and 2. Odor at Cromwell/Hunstock was described as 'sweet', 'candy, sweet', and 'grass, sweet fruity'. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 2 D/T at Pickford Place and the Post Office. These Locations had descriptors of 'trash', however, the source of the trash odor could not be attributed to the Landfill. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.43 and -0.06, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive one to negative eight, with the most negative hedonic tones (-4 through -8) being noted at the Working Face Locations. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between 2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Fishy/Ammonia, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, and Cleaning Solvents with descriptors such as 'trash', 'trash, sour, rotten egg', 'rotten egg'. 'trash, mulch', 'air freshener, trash' and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -2 and -8. No Green Waste was apparent on this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Fishy/Ammonia, Cleaning Solvents, and Dusty/Earthy Categories. Over one-third of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill were recorded as ND. Approximately one-fourth of detected odors onsite were attributed to Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 4 at the Condensate Location (hedonic tone of -3). The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 8.01 and -1.4, respectively.

Weather History Graph June 3, 2015



## Sampling Event 17 – June 4, 2015

Sampling on Thursday, June 4th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:19 and 9:51 AM. Skies were overcast and temperatures decreased from 69 to 59 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity ranged from 56% at the start of sampling, to 77% when the last observation was taken. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.82 to 29.83 inches. Winds were moderate, and originated from the south-southwest, southwest, and south.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Over one-third of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, more than one-half were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite mostly included 'hay', 'grass', and 'wet grass'. Over one-third of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded at the Landfill. No offsite locations had Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations. These odors were detected at the Landfill, with D/Ts of <2 up to 60.

Offsite, D/T ranged from non-detect (ND) up to 2. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from negative three at Hunstock/Lincoln, up to positive two at Chiquito Cyn/Central. Hunstock/Lincoln was noted to have odor descriptors of 'rotten earth', 'grass', and ND, with D/Ts of <2 and 2. Odor at Chiquito Cyn/Central was described as grassy and floral. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 2 D/T at Hunstock/Lincoln. This Location had descriptors of 'grass', 'rotten earth', and ND. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.33 and 0.04, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 4 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive two to negative seven, with the most negative hedonic tones (-4 through -7) being noted at Working Face Locations. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between 2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy, and Cleaning Solvents with descriptors such as 'trash', 'sour trash', 'trash, mulch', 'air freshener' and more. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -1 and -7. No Green Waste was apparent on this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Cleaning Solvents, and Auto Exhaust Categories. Over one-half of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 4 at the Turnout Tank Location (hedonic tone of -3). The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 8.53 and -1.1, respectively.

Weather History Graph June 4, 2015



### Sampling Event 18 – June 11, 2015

Sampling on Thursday, June 11th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:16 and 9:32 AM. Skies were overcast and foggy, and temperatures ranged from 57 to 61 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity remained constant at 100% throughout the sampling duration. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.86 to 29.93 inches. Winds were light from the south-southwest, east-northeast, and east-southeast.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. Over one-third of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, approximately two-thirds were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite mostly included 'hay', 'grass', and variations of sweet descriptors. One-third of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded at the Landfill. Two offsite Locations had Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related observations, however these descriptors were not attributed to the Landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors were detected at the Landfill with D/Ts of <2 up to 60.

Offsite, D/T ranged from non-detect (ND) up to 2. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from negative three at Del Valle 1, up to positive four at Del Valle/Halsey Cyn. Del Valle 1 was noted to have odor descriptors of 'rotten, grass, rain', 'sweet rotten earth', and 'sweet rotten', with D/Ts of <2 and 2 and hedonic tones of -2 and -3. Odor at Chiquito Cyn/Central was described as 'maple syrup, sweet', 'maple syrup', and 'syrup, cocoa'. Overall, the highest noted odors offsite were equal to 2 D/T at the Central East, Hunstock/Lincoln, and Del Valle 1 Locations. These three Locations had descriptors within the Coffee Shop/Pleasant Flavors, Parks and Fields/Nature, Dusty/Earthy, Musty/Moldy Compost, Fecal, and Spoiled Food/Decomposition Categories. No descriptors recorded offsite were attributed to the Landfill. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.69 and 0.18, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 2 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive two to negative eight, with the most negative hedonic tones (-4 through -8) being noted at Working Face Locations. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between 4 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition and Cleaning Solvents with descriptors such as 'trash', 'sour trash', 'trash, mulch', 'sweet sour trash, putrid' and others. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -2 and -8. No Green Waste was apparent on this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Cleaning Solvents, Parks and Fields/Nature, Coffee Shop/Pleasant Flavors, and Dusty/Earthy Categories. Over one-third of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill were recorded as ND. About one-half of detected odors onsite were attributed to Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 2 at the Perimeter North and Condensate Locations, with descriptors of 'trash', 'sour trash', 'faint leachate', and 'trash, hay'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 7.71 and -1.2, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph June 11, 2015



### Sampling Event 19 – June 25, 2015

Sampling on Thursday, June 25th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:11 and 9:57 AM. Skies were mostly clear and temperatures ranged from 61 to 81 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity decreased from 57% to 27% during the sampling duration. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.98 to 30.01 inches. Winds were calm to light from the northwest and northeast.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Spoiled Food/Decomposition and Parks and Fields/Nature. Over one-third of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, over one-third were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite mostly included 'hay', 'grass', and a couple 'faint sour' descriptors. Approximately one-third of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded at the Landfill. No offsite Locations had observations of odors which could be attributed to the Landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors were detected at the Landfill with D/Ts of <2 up to 60.

Offsite, D/T ranged from non-detect (ND) up to 4. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from negative three at Jackson Gate and Monroe/Lincoln, up to positive four at Chiquito Cyn/Central. Jackson Gate and Monroe/Lincoln were noted to have manure odors with D/Ts of <2, 2 and 4. Odor at Chiquito Cyn/Central was described as 'floral' with a D/T of 4. Overall, the highest noted odors offsite were equal to 4 D/T at the Chiquito Cyn/Central and Jackson Gate Locations. These two Locations had descriptors within the Fragrant/Fruity and Fecal Categories, respectively. No descriptors recorded offsite were attributed to the Landfill. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.55 and -0.18, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. More than two-thirds of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 2 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive one to negative eight, with the most negative hedonic tones (-4 through -8) being noted at Working Face Locations. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between 2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Fishy/Ammonia, and Cleaning Solvents with descriptors such as 'trash', 'sweet, sour trash', 'trash, leachate', 'mulch, trash, fishy', and others. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -2 and -8. No Green Waste was apparent on this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, and Dusty/Earthy Categories. Over one-half of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 15 at the Odor System Location, described as 'wet dirt'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 7.98 and -1.4, respectively.

#### Weather History Graph June 25, 2015



### Sampling Event 20 – June 30, 2015

Sampling on Tuesday, June 30th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:14 and 9:32 AM. Skies were mostly clear, and temperatures ranged from 70 to 83 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity decreased from 39% to 27% during the sampling duration. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.88 to 29.93 inches. Winds were calm and light from the northwest, north, and north-northeast.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. About one-half of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, about two-thirds were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite included 'hay', 'grass', and 'eucalyptus, herby' descriptors. Over one-half of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded at the Landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors were detected at the Landfill with D/Ts of <2 up to 60.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND up to 7. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations ranged from negative four at Jackson Gate, up to positive eight at Liverpool Court. Jackson Gate was noted to have horse manure odors with D/Ts of 2 and 7. Odor at Liverpool Court was described as 'floral' and 'honeysuckle' with a D/T of 7. Overall, the highest noted odors offsite were equal to 7 D/T at the Liverpool Court and Jackson Gate Locations. One offsite Location, Chiquito Canyon South, was noted to have stale trash-like odor at D/Ts of 2 and 4. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 1.23 and 0.72, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 2 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive two to negative six, with the most negative hedonic tones (-5 and -6) being noted at Working Face Locations. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between <2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Dusty/Earthy, and Musty/Moldy Compost with descriptors such as 'trash', 'sour trash', 'moldy, mulchy, stale trash', 'trash, wet dirt', and others. Hedonic tones at the Working Face and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Fragrant/Fruity, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, Dusty/Earthy, and Fecal Categories. Over one-half of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 4 at the White Tanks Location, described as 'stale trash'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 7.91 and -0.9, respectively.

Weather History Graph June 30, 2015



## Sampling Event 21 – July 1, 2015

Sampling on Wednesday, July 1st, 2015, took place between approximately 6:13 and 9:30 AM. Skies were partly to mostly cloudy, and temperatures ranged from 73 to 84 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity decreased from 39% to 27% during the sampling duration. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.88 to 29.93 inches. Winds were light from the northwest, north, and north-northeast.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. More than one-third of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, about two-thirds were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite included 'hay', 'grass', and 'sage' as well as spicy and peppery descriptors. About one-third of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded at the Landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition descriptors were detected at the Landfill with D/Ts of <2 up to 60.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND to 4. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations were lowest at values of negative one at Wolcott Turn, Livingston/Watertank, Fire Center Road, Del Valle/Halsey Cyn, Del Valle 2, Post Office, Madison/Lincoln, and Chiquito Cyn/Madison. The most pleasant hedonic tone was recorded at positive five at Liverpool Court. Records of Locations with hedonic tones of -1 were described within the Parks and Fields/Nature, Dusty/Earthy, and Spoiled Food/Decomposition Categories. Odor at Liverpool Court was described as 'honeysuckle' and 'floral' with D/Ts of 2 and 4. Overall, the highest noted odor offsite was equal to 4 D/T at Liverpool Court. No offsite Locations had odors which were attributed to the Landfill. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.43 and 0.20, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 2 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive three to negative six. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between ND and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Cleaning Solvents, Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic, and Musty/Moldy Compost with descriptors such as 'trash', 'rotten egg', 'disinfectant', 'air freshener', 'trash, sharp, mulch', 'trash, leachate', and others. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -6 and 2. The positive hedonic tone was likely due to the operating odor system located nearby. No Green Waste was apparent on this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Dusty/Earthy, Bakery, and Fishy/Ammonia Categories. Over one-half of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill were recorded as ND. Less than one-fourth of detected odors at other onsite Locations were attributed to Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 7 at the White Tanks Location, described as 'trash, rotten'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 3.57 and -0.9, respectively.
Weather History Graph July 1, 2015



## Sampling Event 22 – July 2, 2015

Sampling on Thursday, July 2nd, 2015, took place between approximately 6:20 and 9:42 AM. Skies were partly cloudy and temperatures ranged from 69 to 77 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity decreased from 65% to 48% during the sampling duration. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.97 to 30.01 inches. Winds were calm to light from the north, north-northeast, east-northeast, and south.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Spoiled Food/Decomposition and Parks and Fields/Nature. About one-third of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, two-thirds were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite included 'hay', 'grass', and 'rotten sage' as well as spicy and herbal descriptors. More than one-third of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded at the Landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related odors were detected at the Landfill with D/Ts of <2 up to 60. No offsite Locations were described within the Spoiled Food/Decomposition Category.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND to 7. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations were lowest at values of negative four at Jackson Gate, to positive seven at Liverpool Court. Jackson Gate odors were described as 'manure' and 'horse manure' at D/Ts of 2 and 4. Odor at Liverpool Court was described as 'honeysuckle, sweet', 'honeysuckle', and 'floral' with D/Ts of 4 and 7. Overall, the highest noted odors offsite were equal to 7 D/T at Liverpool Court and Livingston/Watertank. No offsite Locations had odors which were attributed to the Landfill. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.95 and 0.24, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Over three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 2 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive one to negative seven. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between ND and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Cleaning Solvents, and Dusty/Earthy, with descriptors such as 'trash, mulch', 'trash, vinegar, sharp, leachate', 'air freshener', 'sweet trash, mulch', and others. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -7 and -1. No Green Waste was apparent on this day. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Dusty/Earthy, and Fishy/Ammonia Categories. Over one-third of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 7 at Perimeter North, and was described as 'trash', 'sweet trash, run off'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 3.98 and -1.2, respectively.

Weather History Graph July 2, 2015



## Sampling Event 23 – July 14, 2015

Sampling on Tuesday, July 14th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:38 and 9:39 AM. Skies were mostly clear and temperatures ranged from 61 to 75 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity decreased from 76% to 48% during the sampling duration. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.88 to 29.93 inches. Winds were light from the northeast and east-southeast.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Parks and Fields/Nature and Spoiled Food/Decomposition. More than one-third of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, about one-half were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite included 'wet hay, musty', 'grass', and 'wet grass'. About one-third of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded at the Landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related odors were detected at the Landfill with D/Ts of <2 up to 60. Three offsite Locations were described within the Spoiled Food/Decomposition Category. These odors were suspected to be related to the Landfill at two of these Locations.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND to 4. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations were lowest at values of negative four at Jackson Gate, and highest (positive three) at the Chiquito Cyn/Central, Del Valle/Halsey Cyn, and Livingston/Watertank Locations. Chiquito Cyn/Central, Del Valle/Halsey Cyn, and Livingston/Watertank had recorded D/Ts between ND and <2, and were described with Fragrant/Fruity, Musty/Moldy Compost, Parks and Fields/Nature, and Soapy descriptors. Jackson Gate odors were described as Fecal, at D/Ts of 2 and 4, with hedonic tones of -2 and -4. Overall, the odors noted to have the highest D/Ts offsite were recorded at 4 D/T at the Cromwell/Hunstock, Fire Center Road, and Jackson Gate Locations. All three of these Locations had unpleasant hedonic tones. A 'trash, rotten' odor was noted at Fire Center Road, and was suspected to be attributed to the Landfill. Chiquito Cyn South was also suspected to have odors associated with the Landfill ('trash', 'faint sour trash', and descriptors with D/Ts equal to <2). No other offsite Locations had odors which were attributed to the Landfill. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.80 and -0.14, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. About three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 2 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive one to negative five. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between 2 and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Musty/Moldy Compost, and Dusty/Earthy, with descriptors such as 'mulch, faint sharp trash', 'pungent, trash', 'musty, mulch', 'wet dirt', 'strong mulch', and others. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -4 and 1. Other locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Auto Exhaust, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Parks and Fields/Nature, Fecal, Dusty/Earthy, Bakery, and Sulfur/Cabbage/Garlic Categories. More than one-third of observations made in the other locations throughout the Landfill waste. The Odor System Location had a D/T equal to 60 and was described as 'rotten, trash', and 'strong, sweet rancid trash'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 8.25 and -0.9, respectively.

Weather History Graph July 14, 2015



### Sampling Event 24 – July 15, 2015

Sampling on Wednesday, July 15th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:40 and 11:55 AM. Skies were mostly clear and temperatures ranged from 59 to 80 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity decreased from 92% to 46% during the sampling duration. Barometric air pressure rose from 29.93 to 29.95 inches. Winds were light and moderate from the north, east-northeast, east, east-southeast, and west-southwest.

This sampling event was notable because it was the first occasion in which landfill odors were clearly detected in the Val Verde community.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Parks and Fields/Nature then Spoiled Food/Decomposition. About half of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, about one-half were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite included wet grass, wet hay, and some floral and sweet descriptors. About one-third of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded at the Landfill. Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related odors were detected at the Landfill with D/Ts of <2 up to 60.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND to 7. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations were lowest at values of negative three at Jackson Gate and Wolcott Light; to positive three at Liverpool Court, Livingston/Watertank, and Post Office. Jackson Gate was noted to have a Fecal odor. Wolcott Light had detections of 'trash' and 'sour trash' at <2, believed to be associated with the Landfill. Liverpool Court had a 'floral, honeysuckle' odor and the Post Office had Bakery-related odors. At Livingston/Watertank, ND, 'sour trash', and 'shampoo' were all noted, with hedonic tones ranging between negative two and positive three. The 'sour trash' record was suspected to be from the Landfill, however it may have been from a nearby confounding source instead. Six offsite Locations (Taylor/Linclon, Central East, San Martinez/Lincoln, Del Valle 1, Wolcott Light, and Livingston/Watertank) were suspected to have odors related to the Landfill, with D/Ts ranging between <2 and 4. Central East and Taylor/Lincoln had the highest detections. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.83 and - 0.34, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 2 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive two to negative seven. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between ND and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Fishy/Ammonia, and Musty/Moldy Compost, with descriptors such as 'mulch', 'sweet, leachate', 'sharp sweet mulch', 'seafood, sharp, trash, sweet', and others. Hedonic tones at the Working Face ranged between -7 and -1. Other Locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Parks and Fields/Nature, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, and Cleaning Solvents Categories. More than half of the observations made in the other Locations throughout the Landfill were recorded as ND. Less than one-fourth of the detected odors at other onsite Locations were attributed to Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than Locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 15 at Condensate, and was described as 'condensate', 'sour, mulch, leachate', and 'condensate, chemical'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 7.20 and -1.2, respectively.

Weather History Graph July 15, 2015



### Sampling Event 25 – July 16, 2015

Sampling on Thursday, July 16th, 2015, took place between approximately 6:28 and 9:27 AM. Skies were mostly sunny and partly cloudy, and temperatures ranged from 57 to 69 degrees Fahrenheit. Humidity decreased from 92% to 75% during the sampling duration. Barometric air pressure remained constant at 29.97 inches. Winds were calm to light from the west-northwest, north-northwest, and east.

Throughout all Locations, NDs were most common, followed by descriptors relating to Spoiled Food/Decomposition then Parks and Fields/Nature. About half of NDs were recorded on the Landfill Property. Of the offsite NDs, more than one-third were recorded in the Val Verde Community. Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors recorded offsite included grass, hay, and some sweet descriptors. Over three-quarters of all Parks and Fields/Nature descriptors were recorded offsite. Spoiled Food/Decomposition-related odors were detected at the Landfill with D/Ts of <2 up to 60.

Offsite, D/T ranged from ND to 4. Hedonic tones noted at offsite locations were lowest at values of negative three at Harding South Turn, Jackson Gate, Livingston/Watertank, and Monroe/Lincoln; to positive three at Del Valle/Halsey Cyn and Chiquito Cyn/Central. Jackson Gate, Harding South Turn, and Monroe/Lincoln had odors described within the Fecal Category. Livingston/Watertank had a detection of 'sour trash', however dumpsters were located nearby on this day, so the descriptor could not be attributed to the Landfill. Chiquito Cyn/Central and Del Valle/Halsey Cyn had pleasant descriptors within the Fragrant/Fruity, Bakery, and Coffee Shop Categories. Two offsite Locations, Harding Lot and Madison/Lincoln, were noted to have odors described as 'sweet, trash', 'faint sweet trash', 'faint sour trash', at D/Ts of <2 and 2. These odors were suspected to be Landfill-related, however the trash odors were very faint. All other offsite Locations had no Landfill-related odors. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the offsite Locations was 0.75 and -0.27, respectively.

Onsite, D/Ts ranged from ND to 60. Three-quarters of observations on the Landfill noted odors lesser than or equal to 2 D/T. Observations of hedonic tone ranged from positive one to negative eight. D/T at and near the Working Face ranged between ND and 60. Odors at the Working Face were recorded as ND, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, and Musty/Moldy Compost, with descriptors such as 'sour trash, mulch', 'air freshener, mulch', 'mulch, bologna, sweet', and others. Hedonic tones at the Working Face were described between -8 and -2. Other Locations onsite and not immediately near the Working Face were described within the ND, Dusty/Earthy, Spoiled Food/Decomposition, Auto Exhaust, Cleaning Solvents, and Parks and Fields/Nature Categories. Roughly half of the observations made in the other Locations throughout the Landfill waste. The highest D/T recorded other than Locations at or near the Working Face was equal to 7 at Perimeter North, described as 'sour trash'. The Average D/T and hedonic tone throughout the Landfill was 8.34 and -1.4, respectively.

Weather History Graph July 16, 2015



# Appendix D Pie Charts of Odor Descriptors and Suspected Sources for Location Groups

























































# Attachment 1 Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Paul Rosenfeld



# Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.

Chemical Fate and Transport & Air Dispersion Modeling

Principal Environmental Chemist

**Risk Assessment & Remediation Specialist** 

#### **Education:**

Ph.D. Soil Chemistry, University of Washington, 1999. Dissertation on VOC filtration.M.S. Environmental Science, U.C. Berkeley, 1995. Thesis on organic waste economics.B.A. Environmental Studies, U.C. Santa Barbara, 1991. Thesis on wastewater treatment.

#### **Professional Experience:**

Dr. Rosenfeld is the Co-Founder and Principal Environmental Chemist at Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE). His focus is the fate and transport of environmental contaminants, risk assessment, and ecological restoration. Dr. Rosenfeld has a doctorate in soil chemistry and has evaluated odors from biosolids applications to soil and the effect of biosolids to agricultural crops. Dr. Rosenfeld has also evaluated odor emissions from the compost and food industry. His project experience ranges from monitoring and modeling of pollution sources as they relate to human and ecological health. Dr. Rosenfeld has investigated and designed remediation programs and risk assessments for contaminated sites containing petroleum, chlorinated solvents, pesticides, radioactive waste, PCBs, PAHs, dioxins, furans, volatile organics, semi-volatile organics, perchlorate, heavy metals, asbestos, PFOA, unusual polymers, MtBE, fuel oxygenates and odor. Dr. Rosenfeld has also evaluated and modeled emissions from fracking, boilers, incinerators and other industrial and agricultural sources relating to nuisance and personal injury. Dr. Rosenfeld has evaluated greenhouse gas emissions using various modeling programs recommended by California Air Quality Management Districts.

#### **Professional History:**

Soil Water Air Protection Enterprise (SWAPE); 2003 to present; Principal and Founding Partner UCLA School of Public Health; 2007 to 2011; Lecturer (Assistant Researcher) UCLA School of Public Health; 2003 to 2006; Adjunct Professor UCLA Environmental Science and Engineering Program; 2002-2004; Doctoral Intern Coordinator UCLA Institute of the Environment, 2001-2002; Research Associate Komex H<sub>2</sub>O Science, 2001 to 2003; Senior Remediation Scientist National Groundwater Association, 2002-2004; Lecturer San Diego State University, 1999-2001; Adjunct Professor Anteon Corp., San Diego, 2000-2001; Remediation Project Manager Ogden (now Amec), San Diego, 2000-2000; Remediation Project Manager Bechtel, San Diego, California, 1999 – 2000; Risk Assessor King County, Seattle, 1996 – 1999; Scientist James River Corp., Washington, 1995-96; Scientist Big Creek Lumber, Davenport, California, 1995; Scientist Plumas Corp., California and USFS, Tahoe 1993-1995; Scientist Peace Corps and World Wildlife Fund, St. Kitts, West Indies, 1991-1993; Scientist Bureau of Land Management, Kremmling Colorado 1990; Scientist

# Publications:

Chen, J. A., Zapata, A R., Sutherland, A. J., Molmen, D. R., Chow, B. S., Wu, L. E., **Rosenfeld, P. E.,** Hesse, R. C., (2012) Sulfur Dioxide and Volatile Organic Compound Exposure To A Community In Texas City Texas Evaluated Using Aermod and Empirical Data. *American Journal of Environmental Science*, 8(6), 622-632.

Rosenfeld, P.E. & Feng, L. (2011). The Risks of Hazardous Waste. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & Rosenfeld, P.E. (2011). Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Agrochemical Industry, Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Gonzalez, J., Feng, L., Sutherland, A., Waller, C., Sok, H., Hesse, R., **Rosenfeld, P.** (2010). PCBs and Dioxins/Furans in Attic Dust Collected Near Former PCB Production and Secondary Copper Facilities in Sauget, IL. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*. 113–125.

Feng, L., Wu, C., Tam, L., Sutherland, A.J., Clark, J.J., **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2010). Dioxin and Furan Blood Lipid and Attic Dust Concentrations in Populations Living Near Four Wood Treatment Facilities in the United States. *Journal of Environmental Health*. 73(6), 34-46.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & Rosenfeld, P.E. (2010). Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Wood and Paper Industries. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Cheremisinoff, N.P., & Rosenfeld, P.E. (2009). Handbook of Pollution Prevention and Cleaner Production: Best Practices in the Petroleum Industry. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., **Rosenfeld**, **P**. (2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. *WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment, Air Pollution*, 123 (17), 319-327.

Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and **Rosenfeld**, **P.E.** (2008). A Statistical Analysis Of Attic Dust And Blood Lipid Concentrations Of Tetrachloro-p-Dibenzodioxin (TCDD) Toxicity Equivalency Quotients (TEQ) In Two Populations Near Wood Treatment Facilities. *Organohalogen Compounds*, 70, 002252-002255.

Tam L. K., Wu C. D., Clark J. J. and **Rosenfeld**, **P.E.** (2008). Methods For Collect Samples For Assessing Dioxins And Other Environmental Contaminants In Attic Dust: A Review. *Organohalogen Compounds*, 70, 000527-000530.

Hensley, A.R. A. Scott, J. J. J. Clark, **Rosenfeld**, **P.E.** (2007). Attic Dust and Human Blood Samples Collected near a Former Wood Treatment Facility. *Environmental Research*. 105, 194-197.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** J. J. J. Clark, A. R. Hensley, M. Suffet. (2007). The Use of an Odor Wheel Classification for Evaluation of Human Health Risk Criteria for Compost Facilities. *Water Science & Technology* 55(5), 345-357.

Rosenfeld, P. E., M. Suffet. (2007). The Anatomy Of Odour Wheels For Odours Of Drinking Water, Wastewater, Compost And The Urban Environment. *Water Science & Technology* 55(5), 335-344.

Sullivan, P. J. Clark, J.J.J., Agardy, F. J., Rosenfeld, P.E. (2007). *Toxic Legacy, Synthetic Toxins in the Food, Water, and Air in American Cities.* Boston Massachusetts: Elsevier Publishing,

Rosenfeld P.E., and Suffet, I.H. (Mel) (2007). Anatomy of an Odor Wheel. Water Science and Technology.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E.**, Clark, J.J.J., Hensley A.R., Suffet, I.H. (Mel) (2007). The use of an odor wheel classification for evaluation of human health risk criteria for compost facilities. *Water Science And Technology*.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash. *Water Science and Technology*. 49(9),171-178.

**Rosenfeld P. E.,** J.J. Clark, I.H. (Mel) Suffet (2004). The Value of An Odor-Quality-Wheel Classification Scheme For The Urban Environment. *Water Environment Federation's Technical Exhibition and Conference (WEFTEC)* 2004. New Orleans, October 2-6, 2004.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E.**, and Suffet, I.H. (2004). Understanding Odorants Associated With Compost, Biomass Facilities, and the Land Application of Biosolids. *Water Science and Technology*. 49(9), 193-199.

Rosenfeld, P.E., and Suffet I.H. (2004). Control of Compost Odor Using High Carbon Wood Ash, *Water Science and Technology*, 49(9), 171-178.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.**, Grey, M. A., Sellew, P. (2004). Measurement of Biosolids Odor and Odorant Emissions from Windrows, Static Pile and Biofilter. *Water Environment Research*. 76(4), 310-315.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E.**, Grey, M and Suffet, M. (2002). Compost Demonstration Project, Sacramento California Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. *Integrated Waste Management Board Public Affairs Office*, Publications Clearinghouse (MS–6), Sacramento, CA Publication #442-02-008.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, and C.L. Henry. (2001). Characterization of odor emissions from three different biosolids. *Water Soil and Air Pollution*. 127(1-4), 173-191.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E.**, and Henry C. L., (2000). Wood ash control of odor emissions from biosolids application. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 29, 1662-1668.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E.**, C.L. Henry and D. Bennett. (2001). Wastewater dewatering polymer affect on biosolids odor emissions and microbial activity. *Water Environment Research*. 73(4), 363-367.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E.**, and C.L. Henry. (2001). Activated Carbon and Wood Ash Sorption of Wastewater, Compost, and Biosolids Odorants. *Water Environment Research*, 73, 388-393.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E.**, and Henry C. L., (2001). High carbon wood ash effect on biosolids microbial activity and odor. *Water Environment Research*. 131(1-4), 247-262.

Chollack, T. and **P. Rosenfeld.** (1998). Compost Amendment Handbook For Landscaping. Prepared for and distributed by the City of Redmond, Washington State.

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1992). The Mount Liamuiga Crater Trail. *Heritage Magazine of St. Kitts*, 3(2).

Rosenfeld, P. E. (1993). High School Biogas Project to Prevent Deforestation On St. Kitts. *Biomass Users Network*, 7(1).

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions From Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. Doctoral Thesis. University of Washington College of Forest Resources.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (1994). Potential Utilization of Small Diameter Trees on Sierra County Public Land. Masters thesis reprinted by the Sierra County Economic Council. Sierra County, California.

**Rosenfeld**, **P. E.** (1991). How to Build a Small Rural Anaerobic Digester & Uses Of Biogas In The First And Third World. Bachelors Thesis. University of California.

#### **Presentations:**

**Rosenfeld, P.E.,** Sutherland, A; Hesse, R.; Zapata, A. (October 3-6, 2013). Air dispersion modeling of volatile organic emissions from multiple natural gas wells in Decatur, TX. 44th Western Regional Meeting, American Chemical Society. Lecture conducted from Santa Clara, CA.

Sok, H.L.; Waller, C.C.; Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sutherland, A.J.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; Hesse, R.C.; **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (June 20-23, 2010). Atrazine: A Persistent Pesticide in Urban Drinking Water. *Urban Environmental Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

Feng, L.; Gonzalez, J.; Sok, H.L.; Sutherland, A.J.; Waller, C.C.; Wisdom-Stack, T.; Sahai, R.K.; La, M.; Hesse, R.C.; **Rosenfeld, P.E.** (June 20-23, 2010). Bringing Environmental Justice to East St. Louis, Illinois. *Urban Environmental Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Boston, MA.

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. (April 19-23, 2009). Perfluoroctanoic Acid (PFOA) and Perfluoroactane Sulfonate (PFOS) Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. *2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting*, Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.** (April 19-23, 2009). Cost to Filter Atrazine Contamination from Drinking Water in the United States" Contamination in Drinking Water From the Use of Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF) at Airports in the United States. 2009 Ground Water Summit and 2009 Ground Water Protection Council Spring Meeting. Lecture conducted from Tuscon, AZ.

Wu, C., Tam, L., Clark, J., **Rosenfeld, P**. (20-22 July, 2009). Dioxin and furan blood lipid concentrations in populations living near four wood treatment facilities in the United States. Brebbia, C.A. and Popov, V., eds., *Air Pollution XVII: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Modeling, Monitoring and Management of Air Pollution*. Lecture conducted from Tallinn, Estonia.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (October 15-18, 2007). Moss Point Community Exposure To Contaminants From A Releasing Facility. *The 23<sup>rd</sup> Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water*. Platform lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (October 15-18, 2007). The Repeated Trespass of Tritium-Contaminated Water Into A Surrounding Community Form Repeated Waste Spills From A Nuclear Power Plant. *The 23<sup>rd</sup> Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water*. Platform lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

**Rosenfeld, P. E.** (October 15-18, 2007). Somerville Community Exposure To Contaminants From Wood Treatment Facility Emissions. The 23<sup>rd</sup> Annual International Conferences on Soils Sediment and Water. Lecture conducted from University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA.

**Rosenfeld P. E.** (March 2007). Production, Chemical Properties, Toxicology, & Treatment Case Studies of 1,2,3-Trichloropropane (TCP). *The Association for Environmental Health and Sciences (AEHS) Annual Meeting*. Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

**Rosenfeld P. E.** (March 2007). Blood and Attic Sampling for Dioxin/Furan, PAH, and Metal Exposure in Florala, Alabama. *The AEHS Annual Meeting*. Lecture conducted from San Diego, CA.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., **Rosenfeld P.E.**, Clark, J.J.J. (August 21 – 25, 2006). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. *The 26th International Symposium on Halogenated Persistent Organic Pollutants – DIOXIN2006*. Lecture conducted from Radisson SAS Scandinavia Hotel in Oslo Norway.

Hensley A.R., Scott, A., **Rosenfeld P.E.**, Clark, J.J.J. (November 4-8, 2006). Dioxin Containing Attic Dust And Human Blood Samples Collected Near A Former Wood Treatment Facility. *APHA 134 Annual Meeting & Exposition*. Lecture conducted from Boston Massachusetts.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (October 24-25, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. Mealey's C8/PFOA. *Science, Risk & Litigation Conference*. Lecture conducted from The Rittenhouse Hotel, Philadelphia, PA.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (September 19, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, *Toxicology and Remediation PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference*. Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel, Irvine California.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (September 19, 2005). Fate, Transport, Toxicity, And Persistence of 1,2,3-TCP. *PEMA Emerging Contaminant Conference*. Lecture conducted from Hilton Hotel in Irvine, California.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (September 26-27, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PDBEs. *Mealey's Groundwater Conference*. Lecture conducted from Ritz Carlton Hotel, Marina Del Ray, California.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (June 7-8, 2005). Fate, Transport and Persistence of PFOA and Related Chemicals. *International Society of Environmental Forensics: Focus On Emerging Contaminants*. Lecture conducted from Sheraton Oceanfront Hotel, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (July 21-22, 2005). Fate Transport, Persistence and Toxicology of PFOA and Related Perfluorochemicals. 2005 National Groundwater Association Ground Water And Environmental Law Conference. Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

**Paul Rosenfeld Ph.D**. (July 21-22, 2005). Brominated Flame Retardants in Groundwater: Pathways to Human Ingestion, Toxicology and Remediation. 2005 National Groundwater Association Ground Water and Environmental Law Conference. Lecture conducted from Wyndham Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore Maryland.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and James Clark Ph.D. and Rob Hesse R.G. (May 5-6, 2004). Tert-butyl Alcohol Liability and Toxicology, A National Problem and Unquantified Liability. *National Groundwater Association. Environmental Law Conference*. Lecture conducted from Congress Plaza Hotel, Chicago Illinois.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** (March 2004). Perchlorate Toxicology. *Meeting of the American Groundwater Trust*. Lecture conducted from Phoenix Arizona.

Hagemann, M.F., **Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and Rob Hesse (2004). Perchlorate Contamination of the Colorado River. *Meeting of tribal representatives*. Lecture conducted from Parker, AZ.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** (April 7, 2004). A National Damage Assessment Model For PCE and Dry Cleaners. *Drycleaner Symposium. California Ground Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Radison Hotel, Sacramento, California.

Rosenfeld, P. E., Grey, M., (June 2003) Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. Seventh International In Situ And On Site Bioremediation Symposium Battelle Conference Orlando, FL.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** and James Clark Ph.D. (February 20-21, 2003) Understanding Historical Use, Chemical Properties, Toxicity and Regulatory Guidance of 1,4 Dioxane. *National Groundwater Association. Southwest Focus Conference. Water Supply and Emerging Contaminants.*. Lecture conducted from Hyatt Regency Phoenix Arizona.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.** (February 6-7, 2003). Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. *California CUPA Forum*. Lecture conducted from Marriott Hotel, Anaheim California.

**Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D**. (October 23, 2002) Underground Storage Tank Litigation and Remediation. *EPA Underground Storage Tank Roundtable*. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E**. and Suffet, M. (October 7- 10, 2002). Understanding Odor from Compost, *Wastewater and Industrial Processes. Sixth Annual Symposium On Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association.* Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E**. and Suffet, M. (October 7- 10, 2002). Using High Carbon Wood Ash to Control Compost Odor. *Sixth Annual Symposium On Off Flavors in the Aquatic Environment. International Water Association*. Lecture conducted from Barcelona Spain.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.** and Grey, M. A. (September 22-24, 2002). Biocycle Composting For Coastal Sage Restoration. *Northwest Biosolids Management Association*. Lecture conducted from Vancouver Washington..

**Rosenfeld, P.E**. and Grey, M. A. (November 11-14, 2002). Using High-Carbon Wood Ash to Control Odor at a Green Materials Composting Facility. *Soil Science Society Annual Conference*. Lecture conducted from Indianapolis, Maryland.

**Rosenfeld. P.E.** (September 16, 2000). Two stage biofilter for biosolids composting odor control. *Water Environment Federation*. Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

Rosenfeld. P.E. (October 16, 2000). Wood ash and biofilter control of compost odor. *Biofest*. Lecture conducted from Ocean Shores, California.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.** (2000). Bioremediation Using Organic Soil Amendments. *California Resource Recovery Association*. Lecture conducted from Sacramento California.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation With High-Carbon Wood-Ash. *Water Environment Federation 12th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings*. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E.**, and C.L. Henry. (1999). An evaluation of ash incorporation with biosolids for odor reduction. *Soil Science Society of America*. Lecture conducted from Salt Lake City Utah.

**Rosenfeld, P.E.**, C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Comparison of Microbial Activity and Odor Emissions from Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. *Brown and Caldwell*. Lecture conducted from Seattle Washington.

Rosenfeld, P.E., C.L. Henry. (1998). Characterization, Quantification, and Control of Odor Emissions from Biosolids Application To Forest Soil. *Biofest*. Lecture conducted from Lake Chelan, Washington.

**Rosenfeld, P.E,** C.L. Henry, R. Harrison. (1998). Oat and Grass Seed Germination and Nitrogen and Sulfur Emissions Following Biosolids Incorporation With High-Carbon Wood-Ash. Water Environment Federation 12th Annual Residuals and Biosolids Management Conference Proceedings. Lecture conducted from Bellevue Washington.

**Rosenfeld**, **P.E.**, C.L. Henry, R. B. Harrison, and R. Dills. (1997). Comparison of Odor Emissions From Three Different Biosolids Applied to Forest Soil. *Soil Science Society of America*. Lecture conducted from Anaheim California.

# **Teaching Experience:**

UCLA Department of Environmental Health (Summer 2003 through 20010) Taught Environmental Health Science 100 to students, including undergrad, medical doctors, public health professionals and nurses. Course focused on the health effects of environmental contaminants.

National Ground Water Association, Successful Remediation Technologies. Custom Course in Sante Fe, New Mexico. May 21, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of fuel contaminants associated with underground storage tanks.

National Ground Water Association; Successful Remediation Technologies Course in Chicago Illinois. April 1, 2002. Focused on fate and transport of contaminants associated with Superfund and RCRA sites.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, April and May, 2001. Alternative Landfill Caps Seminar in San Diego, Ventura, and San Francisco. Focused on both prescriptive and innovative landfill cover design.

UCLA Department of Environmental Engineering, February 5, 2002. Seminar on Successful Remediation Technologies focusing on Groundwater Remediation.

University Of Washington, Soil Science Program, Teaching Assistant for several courses including: Soil Chemistry, Organic Soil Amendments, and Soil Stability.

U.C. Berkeley, Environmental Science Program Teaching Assistant for Environmental Science 10.

#### Academic Grants Awarded:

California Integrated Waste Management Board. \$41,000 grant awarded to UCLA Institute of the Environment. Goal: To investigate effect of high carbon wood ash on volatile organic emissions from compost. 2001.

Synagro Technologies, Corona California: \$10,000 grant awarded to San Diego State University. Goal: investigate effect of biosolids for restoration and remediation of degraded coastal sage soils. 2000.

King County, Department of Research and Technology, Washington State. \$100,000 grant awarded to University of Washington: Goal: To investigate odor emissions from biosolids application and the effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions. 1998.

Northwest Biosolids Management Association, Washington State. \$20,000 grant awarded to investigate effect of polymers and ash on VOC emissions from biosolids. 1997.

James River Corporation, Oregon: \$10,000 grant was awarded to investigate the success of genetically engineered Poplar trees with resistance to round-up. 1996.

United State Forest Service, Tahoe National Forest: \$15,000 grant was awarded to investigating fire ecology of the Tahoe National Forest. 1995.

Kellogg Foundation, Washington D.C. \$500 grant was awarded to construct a large anaerobic digester on St. Kitts in West Indies. 1993.

#### **Deposition and/or Trial Testimony:**

In The Circuit Court of Ohio County, West Virginia Robert Andrews, et al. v. Antero, et al. Civil Action N0. 14-C-30000 Rosenfeld Deposition, June 2015 In The Third Judicial District County of Dona Ana, New Mexico Betty Gonzalez, et al. Plaintiffs vs. Del Oro Dairy, Del Oro Real Estate LLC, Jerry Settles and Deward DeRuyter, Defendants

In The Iowa District Court For Muscatine County

Laurie Freeman et. al. Plaintiffs vs. Grain Processing Corporation, Defendant Case No 4980 Rosenfeld Deposition: May 2015

In the Circuit Court of the 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit, in and For Broward County, Florida Walter Hinton, et. al. Plaintiff, vs. City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, a Municipality, Defendant. Case Number CACE07030358 (26) Rosenfeld Deposition: December 2014

In the United States District Court Western District of Oklahoma Tommy McCarty, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Oklahoma City Landfill, LLC d/b/a Southeast Oklahoma City Landfill, et al. Defendants. Case No. 5:12-cv-01152-C Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2014

In the County Court of Dallas County Texas Lisa Parr et al, *Plaintiff*, vs. Aruba et al, *Defendant*. Case Number cc-11-01650-E Rosenfeld Deposition: March and September 2013 Rosenfeld Trial: April 2014

- In the Court of Common Pleas of Tuscarawas County Ohio John Michael Abicht, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Republic Services, Inc., et al., *Defendants* Case Number: 2008 CT 10 0741 (Cons. w/ 2009 CV 10 0987) Rosenfeld Deposition: October 2012
- In the Court of Common Pleas for the Second Judicial Circuit, State of South Carolina, County of Aiken David Anderson, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Norfolk Southern Corporation, et al., *Defendants*. Case Number: 2007-CP-02-1584
- In the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Alabama Jaeanette Moss Anthony, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Drummond Company Inc., et al., *Defendants* Civil Action No. CV 2008-2076 Rosenfeld Deposition: September 2010
- In the Ninth Judicial District Court, Parish of Rapides, State of Louisiana Roger Price, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Roy O. Martin, L.P., et al., *Defendants*. Civil Suit Number 224,041 Division G Rosenfeld Deposition: September 2008
- In the United States District Court, Western District Lafayette Division Ackle et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Citgo Petroleum Corporation, et al., *Defendants*. Case Number 2:07CV1052 Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2009
- In the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Carolyn Baker, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Chevron Oil Company, et al., *Defendants*. Case Number 1:05 CV 227 Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2008

In the Fourth Judicial District Court, Parish of Calcasieu, State of Louisiana

Craig Steven Arabie, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Citgo Petroleum Corporation, et al., *Defendants*. Case Number 07-2738 G

In the Fourteenth Judicial District Court, Parish of Calcasieu, State of Louisiana Leon B. Brydels, *Plaintiffs*, vs. Conoco, Inc., et al., *Defendants*. Case Number 2004-6941 Division A

In the District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, 153<sup>rd</sup> Judicial District Linda Faust, *Plaintiff*, vs. Burlington Northern Santa Fe Rail Way Company, Witco Chemical Corporation A/K/A Witco Corporation, Solvents and Chemicals, Inc. and Koppers Industries, Inc., *Defendants*. Case Number 153-212928-05 Rosenfeld Deposition: December 2006, October 2007 Rosenfeld Trial: January 2008

In the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of San Bernardino Leroy Allen, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Nutro Products, Inc., a California Corporation and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, *Defendants*.
John Loney, Plaintiff, vs. James H. Didion, Sr.; Nutro Products, Inc.; DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, *Defendants*.
Case Number VCVVS044671
Rosenfeld Deposition: December 2009
Rosenfeld Trial: March 2010

In the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama, Northern Division James K. Benefield, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. International Paper Company, *Defendant*. Civil Action Number 2:09-cv-232-WHA-TFM Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2010, June 2011

In the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Los Angeles Leslie Hensley and Rick Hensley, *Plaintiffs*, vs. Peter T. Hoss, as trustee on behalf of the Cone Fee Trust; Plains Exploration & Production Company, a Delaware corporation; Rayne Water Conditioning, Inc., a California Corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, *Defendants*. Case Number SC094173 Rosenfeld Deposition: September 2008, October 2008

In the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Santa Barbara, Santa Maria Branch Clifford and Shirley Adelhelm, et al., all individually, *Plaintiffs*, vs. Unocal Corporation, a Delaware Corporation; Union Oil Company of California, a California corporation; Chevron Corporation, a California corporation; ConocoPhillips, a Texas corporation; Kerr-McGee Corporation, an Oklahoma corporation; and DOES 1 though 100, *Defendants*. Case Number 1229251 (Consolidated with case number 1231299) Rosenfeld Deposition: January 2008

In the United States District Court for Eastern District of Arkansas, Eastern District of Arkansas Harry Stephens Farms, Inc, and Harry Stephens, individual and as managing partner of Stephens Partnership, *Plaintiffs*, vs. Helena Chemical Company, and Exxon Mobil Corp., successor to Mobil Chemical Co., *Defendants*. Case Number 2:06-CV-00166 JMM (Consolidated with case number 4:07CV00278 JMM) Rosenfeld Deposition: July 2010

In the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Texarkana Division Rhonda Brasel, et al., *Plaintiffs*, vs. Weyerhaeuser Company and DOES 1 through 100, *Defendants*. Civil Action Number 07-4037 Rosenfeld Deposition: March 2010 Rosenfeld Trial: October 2010 In the District Court of Texas 21<sup>st</sup> Judicial District of Burleson County Dennis Davis, *Plaintiff*, vs. Burlington Northern Santa Fe Rail Way Company, *Defendant*. Case Number 25,151 Rosenfeld Trial: May 2009

 In the United States District Court of Southern District of Texas Galveston Division
 Kyle Cannon, Eugene Donovan, Genaro Ramirez, Carol Sassler, and Harvey Walton, each Individually and on behalf of those similarly situated, *Plaintiffs*, vs. BP Products North America, Inc., *Defendant*. Case 3:10-cv-00622
 Rosenfeld Deposition: February 2012
 Rosenfeld Trial: April 2013

In the Circuit Court of Baltimore County Maryland

Philip E. Cvach, II et al., *Plaintiffs* vs. Two Farms, Inc. d/b/a Royal Farms, Defendants Case Number: 03-C-12-012487 OT Rosenfeld Deposition: September 2013

# Summary of Comments

• Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing claimed the Proposed Project would result in water quality impacts based on their statements that a portion of the landfill is unlined, that landfill liners leak, and that these conditions would result in impacts to the Santa Clara River and groundwater aquifers.

# Applicant Rebuttal

The following table provides a summary of the commenters' concerns, the findings of the Final EIR<sup>1</sup>, and the location of supporting information and findings in the Final EIR.

| Comment/Concern  | Findings of the Final EIR   | Final EIR Section  |
|--|---|--|
| Project would result in impacts to water quality   | Because of strict siting and design features of the<br>Proposed Project, the project would not result in<br>significant impacts to surface or ground water<br>quality.  | Final EIR Chapter 5, Geology and<br>Hydrogeology, Section 5.3.2, State<br>Regulations and Standards, addresses<br>siting and design requirements for<br>landfills.<br>Final EIR Chapter 7, Water Quality,<br>addresses both surface and<br>groundwater quality.<br>Final EIR Topical Response #10,<br>Environmental Monitoring, includes<br>10a, Groundwater Quality Monitoring<br>and 10b, Surface Water Quality<br>Monitoring. |
|  | Title 27 CCR specifies that municipal solid waste<br>landfills shall be sited where soil characteristics,<br>distance from waste to groundwater, and other<br>factors will ensure no impairment of beneficial<br>use of surface water or of groundwater beneath<br>or adjacent to the landfill. |  |
|  |   |  |
|  | Final EIR Topical Response #30<br>addresses Water Quality.  |  |
|  | Landfill liners leak and the<br>Project will result in impacts<br>to the Santa Clara River and<br>groundwater aquifers  | A central feature of the environmental protection<br>standards for the Proposed Project is the<br>composite liner system, designed to prevent<br>waste from contacting water, and to prevent the<br>escape of leachate or LFG to the air or to waters<br>of the state.   |
| Final EIR Chapter 5, Geology and<br>Hydrogeology, Section 5.6.2, Slope<br>Stability.   |   |  |
| The Proposed Project includes a liner system that<br>meets or exceeds the standards of Title 27 CCR<br>20340 (Title 27), Waste Discharge Requirement<br>(WDR) Order No. 93-062, implementing the<br>United States Environmental Protection Agency<br>(EPA) Subtitle D requirements, and WDR Order<br>No. 98-086. |   | Final EIR Topical Response #14<br>addresses the Landfill Liner System for<br>the Proposed Project.   |
| The Proposed Project landfill liner design is based<br>on the most up-to-date information, including<br>studies following the Northridge Earthquake.   |   |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.
CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL APPLICANT REBUTTAL WATER QUALITY

## Attachments

- Final EIR Topical Response #10, Environmental Monitoring
- Final EIR Topical Response #14, Landfill Liner System
- Final EIR Topical Response #30, Groundwater Quality

# **CCL** Topical Responses

## 10. Environmental Monitoring

The Environmental Monitoring Program for surface water and groundwater, leachate, and air and landfill gas (LFG) is described in detail in the Original Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Chapter 2, Project Description, and summarized in the response to comments below.

## 10a. Groundwater Quality Monitoring

### **Comment Summary**

Comments were received regarding the need and/or adequacy of the environmental monitoring program for area groundwater monitoring wells and riverbed aquifer monitoring. It was requested that the landfill show the community the test results from sampling every half hour, which was stated to be a water agency requirement. Comments were made regarding private or Water District 36 wells, more frequent monitoring requirements for groundwater, and offsite monitoring requirements for groundwater.

### Response

Potential impacts to water quality for the Proposed Project are addressed in Draft EIR Chapter 7, Water Quality. Water quality monitoring for the protection of groundwater at Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL), both for the existing landfill and the proposed expansion, is required by both state and federal regulations, and is under the regulatory authority of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (RWQCB). California water quality monitoring requirements are contained in Title 23, Chapter 15, Article 5, of the California Code of Regulations. Groundwater testing beyond the regulatory requirements is neither warranted nor required. Sampling water every half hour, which was referenced by one commenter as a water agency requirement, is not a requirement of any applicable regulations.

Water quality monitoring has been conducted at CCL since January 1986 and began with the installation of a groundwater monitoring well network. The current program includes an extensive ground water monitoring network, including point of compliance monitoring for potential releases, as required by the RWQCB. The program requires monitoring of the groundwater and the unsaturated (vadose) zone, monitoring for leachate production, monitoring of surface water, and monitoring of the incoming waste stream. The monitoring program is conducted in accordance with the current Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) contained in RWQCB Order No. 98-086. Quarterly monitoring is required by the current waste discharge requirements (WDRs) and MRP for the landfill, and data are reported in semiannual and annual reports submitted to RWQCB. The monitoring program for the Proposed Project will be similar to the existing program and will require approval by the RWQCB under the landfill facility WDRs.

As described in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Section 2.2.8.4, Groundwater and Vadose Zone Monitoring, the extension of the landfill footprint will require abandoning monitoring wells DW-3, DW-6, DW-12, DW-20, DW-24, and DW-25, and piezometers PZ-3, PZ-5, PZ-6, and PZ-7. These will be replaced by seven new monitoring wells (MW-29 through DW-35). Table 2-6 (Chapter 2) of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR summarizes the Proposed Groundwater Monitoring System, and Figure 2-8 shows the location of the existing and proposed groundwater monitoring network. The monitoring wells are

sited to provide the most effective downgradient and upgradient monitoring. The new monitoring wells will be installed prior to landfill development, so that background water quality can be established for each well. As required by RWQCB, all drilling, soil sampling, logging, well construction, and development is conducted under the direction of a California-registered professional geologist. A California-licensed drilling company will drill, construct, and develop the monitoring wells. In addition to collecting groundwater samples from the monitoring wells, other tasks are performed for a typical monitoring event. These tasks include measuring the depth to water in each well, performing and documenting quality assurance/quality control procedures, and visually inspecting the wells to see that they are in proper working order. Groundwater flow at the landfill is evaluated based on the water levels measured in the wells. A potentiometric surface map is constructed, and the groundwater flow direction and gradient are estimated.

Riverbeds are not directly monitored because CCL has an existing onsite groundwater monitoring well network to identify releases. Santa Clara River bed monitoring is not required or planned to be performed as part of this project, and there have been no groundwater or stormwater releases from CCL to indicate the riverbed is threatened. Similarly, there are no offsite groundwater monitoring wells or proposals to install such, because of the extensive onsite groundwater monitoring well network.

Draft EIR, Chapter 7, Section 7.6.1, describes the current and proposed groundwater monitoring and reporting program for CCL. This program includes an extensive groundwater monitoring network, including point of compliance monitoring for potential releases along the entire downgradient perimeter of the landfill, as required by the RWQCB. These monitoring wells are located to provide the earliest indication of groundwater quality changes in the unlikely event of a release from the lined landfill. As described in Chapter 7, the Proposed Project would be in compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, California Code of Regulations Title 27 requirements, and Orders and WDRs issued by the RWQCB. Contamination of groundwater in the vicinity of CCL is not an anticipated impact of the Proposed Project, and groundwater testing beyond the landfill boundary is neither warranted nor required.

With regard to comments that the Proposed Project could potentially impact Water District 36 wells, groundwater flow directions across the project site are well documented to be primarily south and east, generally following the predevelopment surface topography. Groundwater does not flow northwest toward private wells in Val Verde because of the geologic structure and the presence of significant stratigraphic barriers to groundwater flow. Thus, if there are water quality issues in Val Verde wells, such issues would not be the result of groundwater flow from CCL.

Along the northeast perimeter of the site, groundwater flows easterly, not north toward the District 36 well at the corner of Del Valle and Hasley Canyon roads. Groundwater flow north to the District 36 well is precluded by the east-southeast plunging anticline and aquitard layers within the sedimentary sequence, and two branches of the Holser Fault, which likely act to retard groundwater flow across the zone of faulting. The complex bedrock aquifer conditions in this vicinity are not comparable to the referenced alluvial aquifer pumping in the City of Santa Clarita. There is no probability that pumping the District 36 well would draw in groundwater from beneath the landfill.

With regard to comments regarding analyzing groundwater for constituents of concern (COC), Groundwater monitoring requirements for CCL are established in Waste Discharge Order No. 98-086. The site COCs are listed in Order 98-086, page 8, under D. Water Quality Protection Standards. Note that the COC table does not list all constituents by name. Herbicides, pesticides, PCBs, semi-volatile organic compounds, and volatile organic compounds are only listed by their respective test methods. Appendix II of 40 CFR Part 258 Subtitle D lists the constituents that need to be included in each test method. Testing for COCs for groundwater at CCL will continue to be performed according to the requirements of the RWQCB for the Proposed Project, which also includes testing for COCs in the event that the quarterly monitoring parameters indicate a release.

## 10b. Surface Water Quality Monitoring

### **Comment Summary**

Comments were received regarding the need and/or adequacy of the environmental monitoring program for surface water runoff.

### Response

Similar to groundwater, stormwater runoff is currently and will continue to be monitored as required by the RWQCB and current and future WDRs for CCL. CCL manages stormwater from the 639-acre facility in compliance with the federal Clean Water Act, which guards against contamination that could come from the landfill to surface waters, including the Santa Clara River. As required by the Clean Water Act, CCL has a NPDES Permit from the RWQCB that addresses specific design and applicable water quality standards at the facility. CCL manages, monitors, and discharges stormwater in accordance with the NPDES permit and the following additional plans that are required under the NDPDES Permit: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, the Stormwater Monitoring Program, and the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan, as described below. These are described in Section 2.2.8.6, Surface Water Monitoring, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR.

Stormwater discharge from the site will continue to be sampled and analyzed in a manner consistent with the monitoring program outlined in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Stormwater Monitoring Program. Stormwater discharge samples will be analyzed for ammonia, biochemical oxygen demand, cyanide (total), nitrate and nitrite nitrogen, hydrogen ion concentration (pH), phosphorous (total), total suspended solids, specific conductance, oil and grease, volatile organic compounds, sulfate, chemical oxygen demand, total dissolved solids, and the following metals (total): antimony, arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, copper, iron, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, selenium, silver, thallium, and zinc.

Draft EIR Chapter 7, Water Quality, states that the Proposed Project will implement required water quality monitoring and response programs for detecting, characterizing, and responding to releases to surface water. The RWQCB will specify, in facility-specific WDRs, the type or types of monitoring programs required and the specific elements of each monitoring and response programs. Compliance with the WDRs, including required monitoring for surface water, will ensure the potential impacts of the Proposed Project on surface water are less than significant. No additional monitoring requirements are warranted.

### 10c. Leachate Monitoring

### **Comment Summary**

Comments were received regarding the need and/or adequacy of the environmental monitoring program for leachate and need for leachate testing. Comments were received indicating that implementation plans must be presented for leachate monitoring. Comments were also received stating that leachate tests should be conducted at CCL and that such testing would show what waste was brought and what can potentially leave the landfill as gases, odors, particulate, or solid waste, and asked if the results of the tests can be provided. One commenter indicated that collection of an annual leachate sample is inadequate. In addition, one comment inquired if there are plans to install a leachate treatment facility onsite.

### Response

Consistent with Title 27, and the WDRs and MRP issued by the RWQCB for CCL, leachate at the landfill is monitored and tested. The landfill liner system is designed to contain leachate that may accumulate in the landfill and direct it to a leachate collection and removal system sump or storage tank. The leachate is pumped from the collection points periodically, and is currently transported offsite for disposal. Leachate is evaluated annually for COCs in accordance with accepted quantitative analytical procedures and data are reported in the groundwater semiannual and annual reports submitted to RWQCB. Refer to 10a. Groundwater Monitoring, for additional discussion with respect to groundwater monitoring.

Annual collection of a leachate sample, as required by the WDRs and MRP for CCL, is adequate, particularly as leachate is currently transported offsite for disposal. The Proposed Project proposes using leachate onsite for dust control only if WDRs for CCL are revised by the RWQCB. In that case, leachate would either be used for dust control only on the waste footprint within a lined cell, or would be treated onsite before being used for dust control elsewhere on the site.

## 10d. Landfill Gas Monitoring

### **Comment Summary**

A commenter noted that a report referenced in the Original Draft EIR states that volatile organic compounds (VOC) detected in wells DW-1, DW-3, DW-16, and DW-20 are attributed to LFG migration alone. However, the commenter believes that the presence of VOCs can also be due to historical disposal of industrial wastes that occurred at CCL rather than landfill gas (LFG) migration. Another comment was received indicating that the EIR should specify a minimum number of gas probes needed for LFG monitoring and that gas probes should be installed offsite. A comment was received indicating that common LFGs must be monitored. In addition, a comment was received stating that air and LFG monitoring should be done by an agreed third party monitor.

### Response

The report referenced by the commenter is correct regarding the source (LFG) of the VOCs found in the referenced wells. Release investigations found the same VOCs present in LFG, soil gas, and groundwater, demonstrating a transport path from the base of the landfill, through the underlying geologic materials, to groundwater. The installation and operation of LFG collection system improvements resulted in reduced VOCs in groundwater at the impacted wells, which indicated that LFG was the source of the VOCs. These VOC releases occurred from an unlined portion of the landfill before implementation of requirements for landfill liner systems, and does not reflect a potential impact of the Proposed Project, because the waste footprint of the Proposed Project would be lined.

Section 2.2.8.7, Air and Landfill Gas Monitoring, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Project Description, provides a detailed discussion of LFG monitoring. In summary, CCL conducts LFG collection and monitoring in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1150.1 requirements for control of LFG emissions, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) New Source Performance Standards/Emission Guidelines, and Landfill Methane Capture regulations. CCL has a site-specific Rule 1150.1 Compliance Plan, in accordance with SCAQMD Rules and EPA regulations, and has a Title V permit issued by SCAQMD. The Rule 1150.1 Compliance Plan requires CCL to evaluate the performance of the LFG collection and control system by monitoring monthly for the emission or migration of LFG from the landfill. Other parts of the Title V permit place performance standards and testing requirements on the LFG flare. LFG sampling is also required to evaluate the quality and components of the LFG being generated. All landfill areas are monitored regularly to detect onsite LFG surface emissions or subsurface migration of LFG. In addition to the SCAQMD requirements, CCL has a Title 27 LFG monitoring plan approved by the Lead Enforcement Agency and California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. Therefore, there is no need for air and LFG monitoring to be performed by a third party monitor.

Figure 2-9 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR shows the location of existing and proposed LFG monitoring probes. Given the extensive network of LFG probes around the site boundary and robust monitoring program, there is no requirement or need for offsite gas probes to be installed.

## 10e. Air Quality Monitoring

### **Comment Summary**

Comments were raised regarding the need and/or adequacy of the environmental monitoring program for air quality and odors. Specific comments regarding air quality monitoring include concern that the stations used to monitor air quality are too far from CCL; that there is no monitoring for hydrogen sulfide, which can impact health at certain concentrations; and that there is no monitoring of methane, ammonia, and other LFGs. Comments were provided regarding odor inspections and requesting details on measures to prevent nuisance due to odors emanating from the landfill. A comment was provided requesting clarification on landfill hours of operation.

### Response

As stated in Section 2.2.8.7, Air and Landfill Gas Monitoring, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Project Description, the LFG surface monitoring program consists of monthly and quarterly instantaneous landfill surface monitoring to evaluate potential emissions on the landfill surfaces, ambient air sampling at the landfill site boundaries to evaluate the potential offsite migration of landfill emissions, and quarterly and annual reporting to the SCAQMD. The LFG surface monitoring program is designed for CCL to identify surface emissions of LFG at the earliest possible moment. This compliance program requires CCL to mitigate or correct any such identified emissions or migration in a timely fashion, and to re-inspect the suspect area within a stated time period to confirm attainment of the standards.

With respect to attainment status and attainment monitoring data, SCAQMD continuously operates a network of ambient air quality monitors in the Los Angeles basin, including several locations near the landfill. The air monitoring stations monitor for the pollutants that the state and local air quality agencies consider to be pollutants of concern, and the stations are operated according to strict protocols for sampling, analysis, and data validation and reporting. Pollutants monitored include the criteria pollutants required by the federal clean air act for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards established by the EPA. These criteria pollutants include ozone, CO, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in aerodynamic diameter or 2.5 micrometers (PM2.5), sulfur dioxide, and lead. Associated data for these monitoring stations were taken from data published by the California Air Resources Board and EPA. As stated in Section 11.3.3.2, Air Monitoring Data, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, three of the nearest monitoring stations were used to gather information regarding the air quality around CCL: Burbank – West Palm Avenue, Reseda, and Santa Clarita stations. The Santa Clarita station is the closest to the Proposed Project site, approximately 7 miles from the landfill entrance. Sulfur dioxide and PM2.5 monitoring data are not available at the Santa Clarita station, therefore, the Burbank and Reseda stations were used for sulfur dioxide and PM2.5 data, respectively.

Additional air monitoring is conducted at CCL, in the form of weather stations located onsite. One of these has been onsite for 20 years, with a second added 14 years ago proactively by CCL specifically to monitor winds blowing toward Val Verde. These weather stations provide an overview of winds in the

area and provide historical as well as real-time information regarding wind. As a practical tool for immediate visual recognition of wind direction and speed, CCL utilizes multiple wind flags positioned throughout the site, which provide real-time wind direction and speed information to onsite field personnel, allowing them to take immediate steps to address the potential for offsite migration of odor.

Additionally, please see Topical Response #1a, Existing Air Quality and Emissions, Monitoring, and Health Effects, for additional information.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

## 14. Landfill Liner System

## **Summary of Comments**

Comments were received expressing concern about the past performance of the landfill liner during the 1994 Northridge Earthquake and the expected performance of the proposed liner. Commenters questioned how the liner can withstand an earthquake or other natural disaster. Commenters questioned how Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) will be able to identify which parts of the liner are leaking in the event of a natural disaster and how residents will be informed of liner leaks. Commenters asked how the liner will be repaired, what is the cost, if there is enough emergency funding to repair the liner, and if there is a stronger and safer product on the market that can be used and if so, why it isn't being used.

### Response

### Northridge Earthquake

With regards to the performance of the liner during the Northridge Earthquake, a comprehensive postearthquake analysis performed by industry experts determined that the Northridge Earthquake caused two minor, isolated tears in the existing liner and that the integrity of the liner system was not compromised. Within two days of the earthquake, a field inspection was performed by the landfill's engineering consultant, accompanied by representatives of the California Integrated Waste Management Board, Los Angeles County Department of Health Services, and California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Following the field inspection, the engineering consultant performed a thorough evaluation of the incident, including field observation and mapping, conducting a field investigation to check the liner's integrity at various locations, reviewing available literature, obtaining information on the Northridge Earthquake, obtaining field samples, and performing laboratory testing. The evaluation determined that the two minor tears were located on the side slope near the top of the slope. In both instances, overlying soil was cleared away from the area of the tears and the tears repaired by a licensed geomembrane installer and covered with several feet of soil. Because the tears were located near the top of the side slope, the tears did not impair the ability of the liner to protect water quality. Based on the post-earthquake investigation and analysis, the Northridge Earthquake Seismic Evaluation, Chiquita Canyon Landfill report (EMCON, 1994) was prepared and submitted to the California Integrated Waste Management Board and RWQCB, Los Angeles Region. This report is available for review by the public, by request to either of the above-referenced agencies.

As discussed in the Northridge Earthquake Seismic Evaluation, the two minor liner tears were attributable to seismically induced settlement and were not related to slope instability. Vertical settlement on the order of 20 to 30 percent of the refuse thickness is known to naturally occur in landfills over time (EMCON, 1994). Dynamic forces, such as those due to earthquakes, may result in near instantaneous settlement. Movements of the refuse result in stresses that are transferred to the landfill liner. Depending on the properties of the liner, these stresses may result in direct tensile stresses being placed on the liner. The tears in the liner at CCL resulted from these tensile stresses.

Stresses in the liner due to refuse movement are often referred to as downdrag forces. Since refuse settlement occurs in a vertical direction, the downdrag forces affect the landfill side slopes rather than the landfill base. Also, since settlement occurs throughout the refuse mass and the magnitude of the

settlement is related to the underlying refuse thickness, it is intuitive that settlement measured at the landfill surface is the cumulative result of the settlement that occurs in each incremental thickness of refuse. As a result, the downdrag forces are least at the bottom of the landfill side slope, where the underlying refuse thickness is the least, and the greatest at the top of the landfill side slope, where the underlying refuse thickness is greatest. From this discussion of downdrag forces, it is apparent that any tearing of the liner would occur only near the top of the landfill sideslope where the refuse movement due to settlement is the greatest and the downdrag forces due to refuse movement are the greatest.

Settlement that occurs instantaneously may not allow the refuse and surface soil time to internally adjust to movements, and result in the type of surface soil cracking observed at CCL after the Northridge Earthquake. The tensile strain at which a geomembrane liner will tear is at least 15 times greater than the tensile strain at which soil will crack. Consequently, surface soil cracking delineates those areas where liner tears may have occurred. The site inspection and mapping that was performed after the Northridge Earthquake identified those areas where the surface soil was cracked. Where surface soil cracking occurred, the surface soil and underlying refuse were excavated to expose the liner. This effort did not identify any liner tears other than the two minor tears noted above. This result is consistent with the material properties of the surface soil, refuse, and geomembrane liner, the physical behavior of the landfill during an earthquake, and the engineering analysis performed after the earthquake.

The Northridge Earthquake Seismic Evaluation recommended a design change to introduce a slip plane, such as a geotextile, geonet, or similar surface, above the sideslope liner near the anchor trench to prevent strains in the refuse from transferring to the liner (EMCON, 1994). This change has been incorporated in module designs following the Northridge Earthquake.

### **Proposed Liner System**

During preparation of the Master Plan Revision, Dr. Norman Abrahamson updated the seismic hazard assessment for the site (November 2010). Dr. Abrahamson is a recognized expert in seismicity and was intimately involved in several of the studies following the Northridge Earthquake. The seismic hazard assessment update included seismicity and peak ground acceleration. As a result, the Master Plan Revision design is based on the most up-to-date information, including studies following the Northridge Earthquake.

The Proposed Project design reflects the results of detailed slope stability analyses based on the updated seismic hazard assessment for the site. It should be noted that the RWQCB's requirements for slope stability analyses are more stringent than that required by Title 27 *California Code of Regulations*, Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) Order No. 93-062, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Subtitle D requirements, and WDR Order No. 98-086.

A liner system that meets or exceeds the RWQCB and regulatory standards will be constructed on the excavated base and side slopes of each future fill module. The specific liner system design for future modules will be determined during the detailed design of each module. The liner system design will be consistent with the design criteria developed for the landfill and regulatory requirements. The detailed designs and construction documents are prepared using current site characterization information based on geologic mapping of excavations, seismicity and peak horizontal ground acceleration data. The design of future liner systems will continue to include current design and engineering practices and standards and will be developed under the direction of a California-registered civil engineer and be approved by the RWQCB.

The liner system is also designed to contain liquid (leachate) that accumulates in the landfill and direct it to the leachate collection and removal system (LCRS). The LCRS is designed to withstand deformations of the foundation materials anticipated during the design earthquake so that any permanent

displacement of the foundation does not impair the integrity of the liner and LCRS. A soil layer, or approved alternative, termed the "operations layer," is placed over the base liner and on the side slope liner to protect the liner system before waste is placed. The design of the LCRS will continue to be developed under the direction of a California-registered civil engineer.

Prior to construction of each fill module, a design report is prepared and submitted to RWQCB pursuant to *California Code of Regulations* Title 27 and WDR Order No. 98-086. The design report addresses module excavation, liner system design, and LCRS design. The design report includes a slope stability evaluation, pertinent design calculations, construction drawings, construction specifications, and construction quality assurance (CQA) plan.

The design report must be approved by the RWQCB before construction can begin. The CQA plan addresses the monitoring of geosynthetic materials, soil, and rock components of the liner system and LCRS during installation. The CQA plan also defines the extensive testing to be performed during construction to ensure the liner system and LCRS are constructed in accordance with the plans and specifications.

Construction monitoring and testing will be performed under the direction and supervision of a California-registered civil engineer or certified engineering geologist who will document that construction is performed in compliance with the applicable regulations, permits, and the CQA plan. At the completion of construction, a construction report is prepared documenting the construction activities, presenting the results of the CQA monitoring and testing, and certifying that the construction was in accordance with the plans and specifications and the CQA plan. The construction report is submitted to the RWQCB for review and approval. The construction report must be approved before waste can be disposed in a new module.

Following a natural disaster such as the Northridge Earthquake, the liner (and all other containment features of the landfill) would be inspected and if necessary repaired, as was done following the Northridge Earthquake in 1994. Any liner repairs will be performed consistent with good construction practice and will be monitored and tested consistent with the RWQCB-approved CQA plan. Based on the specific experience at this landfill following the Northridge earthquake, the cost of any repairs that might be required is not expected to be substantial or material in the context of the overall operation of the landfill and would be within the operating budget of the landfill. If the cost of repairs were found to be substantial or material in the context of the overall operation of the landfill, CCL's parent company, Waste Connections, the third largest publicly traded waste management company in the United States, has sufficient resources to address the cost of repairs.

Please refer to Topical Response #10, Environmental Monitoring, for a discussion of how CCL will be able to identify potential leaks in the liner system and how residents will be informed of the leaks.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

## 30. Water Quality

## Summary of Comments

Comments were received about potential impacts to water guality, and potential related impacts to biological resources, with particular focus on run-off, the Santa Clara River, and groundwater. A comment was also received indicating that a third party groundwater evaluation should be completed, including monitoring of ground and surface water runoff to evaluate impacts to private wells in Hasley Canyon and Val Verde. It was stated that the proposed expansion puts the landfill too close to the Santa Clara River and it was questioned how Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) will prevent contaminants in run-off from being carried into the Santa Clara River. Other comments stated that the groundwater supply for portions of the Santa Clarita Valley has been contaminated with perchlorate and that cancercausing Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) have been detected in the water supply. It was suggested that the water quality section should have disclosed the potential health risks from the type of VOC's found in the monitoring wells. Comments were made that CCL has not been in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit requirements and that CCL has already had a detrimental effect on storm water quality. It was suggested that expanding the landfill will have a much more detrimental effect on water quality than is stated. Comments suggested that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should include mitigation for potential releases into groundwater, including reference to groundwater extraction as a corrective action, since releases have already occurred from the unlined Primary Canyon.

### Response

Surface drainage at CCL is controlled by diversion berms, drainage channels, overside drains, and sedimentation basins. Exposed soil on slopes is covered with shredded green waste, and final covers are vegetated to control erosion. CCL manages stormwater from the landfill in compliance with the federal Clean Water Act, which guards against contamination that could come from the landfill to surface waters, including the Santa Clara River. As described in Section 2.2.8.6, Surface Water Monitoring, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, CCL has a NPDES Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) as required by the Clean Water Act that addresses specific design and applicable water quality standards at the facility. CCL manages, monitors, and discharges stormwater in accordance with the NPDES permit and the following additional plans that are required under the NPDES Permit: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, the Stormwater Monitoring Program, and the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan. CCL implements the site specific best management practices required by these plans.

Potential impacts to Water Quality for the Proposed Project are addressed in the Original Draft EIR Chapter 7, Water Quality. Specifically, the Proposed Project would minimize impacts to surface and groundwater quality because it would be implemented in compliance with NPDES requirements, *California Code of Regulations* Title 27 requirements, and Orders and waste discharge requirements (WDR) issued by RWQCB. This includes preparing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Stormwater Monitoring Program, and their associated best management practices, in accordance with the General Permit issued under SWRCB Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, NPDES requirements, and RWQCB Order No. R4-2011-0052. In addition, the Proposed Project will meet or incorporate the siting and design features in accordance with Title 27, Chapter 3, Subchapter 2, and will comply with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance, as described in Section 7.1.1.1, Proposed Project, of the Original Draft EIR.

Chapter 8, Biological Resources, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR contains an evaluation of potential water quality impacts to biological resources.

With regard to the proximity of CCL to the Santa Clara River, the Proposed Project does not move the property boundary of CCL any closer to the Santa Clara River. One part of the proposed lateral expansion moves the waste footprint to the north and east within the landfill property; the other part of the proposed lateral expansion moves the waste footprint slightly to the south within the landfill property, but not as far south as the existing closed Primary Canyon Landfill. The waste footprint is well within the control features of the landfill that prevent impacts to the Santa Clara River.

Water quality monitoring for the protection of groundwater at CCL, both for the existing landfill and the proposed expansion, is required by both State and Federal regulations, and is under the regulatory authority of the RWQCB. California water quality monitoring requirements are contained in Title 23, Chapter 15, Article 5, of the California Code of Regulations. Please see Master Response #10, Environmental Monitoring, for information about the existing and proposed water quality monitoring program.

The groundwater monitoring and remediation program is being implemented and is protective under oversight of the RWQCB. As described in detail in the Chapter 7, Section 7.6.1.4, Groundwater Quality Monitoring Results of the Original Draft EIR, groundwater monitoring for wells in the Evaluation Monitoring Plan and the corrective action program have VOC concentrations measured at low levels, below method detection limits. The extensive Detection Monitoring Program well network showed no impacts to groundwater.

The discussion referenced in Chapter 5, Geology and Hydrology, Section 5.7.2.6 of the Original Draft EIR is about whether the Proposed Project would deplete groundwater supplies as part of a corrective action program. The releases mentioned by the commenter are correctly attributed to the unlined Primary Canyon, and would not be expected as part of the Proposed Project, which includes a liner system that meets or exceeds the standards of Title 27 California Code of Regulations 20340, WDR Order No. 93-062, implementing the United States Environmental Protection Agency Subtitle D requirements, and WDR Order No. 98-086. Therefore, a release to groundwater is not an anticipated potential impact of the Proposed Project and mitigation is not required or needed.

## Summary of Comments

• At the March 1, 2017 Regional Planning Commission Hearing, testifiers expressed concerns regarding landslide risks and earthquake fault risks.

## Applicant Rebuttal

- The Proposed Project will be safe from hazard of landslide, settlement, or slippage, and will not adversely affect the geotechnical conditions of offsite properties.
- Chiquita Canyon Landfill has been extensively and exhaustively studied, as demonstrated in the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR)<sup>1</sup> Appendix D:
  - D-1 Geotechnical Investigation
  - D-2 Geotechnical Evaluation of Updated Excavation Plan
  - D-3 Classification of Geotechnical Issues

## Attachments

• Final EIR Topical Response #11, Geologic Hazards

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

## 11. Geologic Hazards

### Summary of Comments

Comments were received expressing concern that the landfill expansion design has not adequately considered liquefaction and potential seismic hazards, such as impacts on liner construction and slope stability. The Val Verde Civic Association (VVCA) in particular, requested specific information about the methodology used to evaluate slope stability. Concern was raised that unverified and unrealistic values were used to increase the factor of safety for the stability analysis, thereby creating a false stability analysis, whereas a potentially unstable one may exist. VVCA requested that all geotechnical-related reports and analyses be made available to the VVCA for peer review prior to approval of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Additional comments stated that there is an increased risk of landslides from earthquakes and during El Nino years and that the project is a landslide risk to Val Verde and the proposed Landmark Village Development. It was stated that there is a lack of mitigation for catastrophic geological soils failure and that the proposed mitigation measures do not address the loss of life, property, environmental pollution, reduced access to Chiquito Canyon Road, and details about the future structural integrity of previously graded and adjacent areas. Comments referenced previous incidences at the landfill that occurred during the Northridge Earthquake in 1994 and during the rainy season in 2004 to 2005.

### Response

### Liquefaction Analysis in the Draft EIR

Original Draft EIR Chapter 5, Geology and Hydrogeology, Section 5.6.5.6, Liquefaction Hazard, describes the potential for liquefaction at Chiquito Canyon Landfill (CCL) as a result of a seismic event (ground shaking of sufficient magnitude and duration). This section states that soils that are susceptible to liquefaction (loose alluvial soils) "within the proposed development area will be removed and replaced with compacted fill soils." Ultimately, "the site will be underlain by a combination of bedrock materials, dense alluvial deposits, and engineered fill." The section also states, "Since the alluvial soils that have a potential to be subject to liquefaction are not saturated when the groundwater is at its historical high level, the proposed development area is considered to have a very low potential for liquefaction." The combination of detailed geologic investigations and project design features ensure that potential impacts associated with liquefaction will be less than significant.

### Seismic Analysis in the Draft EIR

An evaluation of geology, seismicity, faults, hydrogeology, slope stability, and other potential geologic hazards is included in Original Draft EIR Chapter 5, Geology and Hydrology. Appendixes C and D of the Original Draft EIR include detailed site-specific hydrogeologic and geotechnical investigations and these reports have been available for review by the public since July 10, 2014. The Proposed Project is designed to comply with the California Code of Regulations Title 27, as enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region 4, which include siting criteria, seismic design standards, and containment system design and construction strategies to prevent impacts to surface water and groundwater resources. Specifically, Subsection 203700, Seismic Design, requires Class III facilities to be designed to withstand the maximum probable earthquake (MPE) without damage to the foundation or

the structures which control leachate, surface drainage, erosion, or gas. The MPE is the maximum earthquake that is likely to occur during an IOO-year period. The MPE is determined based on criteria presented in California Division of Mines and Geology Note #43.

As part of static and seismic slope stability analyses for CCL by Golder (2012), Dr. Norman Abrahamson prepared an updated seismic hazard report for the site. The seismic hazard report is based on direction previously provided by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, requiring that permanent landfill slopes be designed to withstand the peak ground acceleration associated with the maximum credible earthquake standard, and interim landfill slopes be designed to withstand the peak ground acceleration having a 10 percent probability of exceedance in 5 years. The maximum credible earthquake standard that is applied at CCL is a higher standard than the MPE standard, the minimum required by Title 27 for Class III landfills, and has previously been used as the standard for design at CCL.

The engineering qualities of the onsite soil and bedrock materials were based on laboratory analyses of undisturbed representative soil/rock samples collected onsite during numerous geotechnical investigations over decades within the landfill. Original Draft EIR Section 5.4.2, Geotechnical Investigation, discusses the various geotechnical investigations that have been performed at CCL. Furthermore, the engineering competency of onsite soil and bedrock materials was visually observed in numerous exploratory borings and in road cuts within the landfill by a certified engineering geologist with 38 years of experience, including 30 years of experience on projects within the Santa Clarita/Castaic area. The laboratory testing of the onsite materials included shear strength tests, consolidation tests, and expansion tests.

### **Saugus Formation Shear Values**

Saugus Formation cross-bedded shear strengths were based on laboratory analyses of several bedrock samples of the Saugus Formation collected onsite during geotechnical investigations of East Main Canyon, South Main Canyon, the landfill entrance road, and the Master Plan Revision. These shear strengths were documented in geotechnical reports issued in 2006, 2009, and 2012. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Geotechnical and Materials Engineering Division (GMED) reviewed the 2012 Master Plan Revision Report prior to release of the Draft EIR. Review of geotechnical reports for projects surrounding CCL (Parcel Map 18108, Parcel Map 26363, Parcel Map 19784, Vesting Tentative Tract Map 60678, and the extension of Franklin Parkway) indicate that the Saugus Formation cross bedded shear strength values used in stability analyses for static and seismic conditions are both realistic and verifiable. An equivalent Saugus Formation cross-bedding strength was recently recommended and approved by GMED for Vesting Tentative Tract Map 60678, located south and across the Santa Clara River from CCL.

### Potential Conflicts with Existing and Proposed Developments

The Proposed Project does not conflict with existing developments. The proposed Landmark Village Development and the potential impacts of the Proposed Project and other nearby proposed developments have been evaluated throughout the resource chapters of the Draft EIR. Chapter 5 of the Original Draft EIR concludes that any potential for debris flow would be contained onsite as a result of project design. The housing developments and schools proposed for the area would not be at risk or "incompatible" with the Proposed Project. The EIR prepared for the proposed Landmark Village considered CCL in its evaluation of several resource areas, including noise, hydrology, air quality, solid waste, and environmental safety. CCL was not identified in the Landmark Village EIR as a concern regarding geology or seismic hazards. Potential geologic hazards are typically managed through sitespecific engineering and mitigation. Therefore, based on the Proposed Project design and site investigations described in Chapter 5 and summarized above, no additional mitigation beyond the measures listed in the Original Draft EIR are required or needed. Mitigation measures are not provided for catastrophic geological soils failure as this was not found to be a potentially significant impact.

For a discussion on the adequacy of the landfill liner and comments related to the 1994 Northridge earthquake, see Topical Response #14 "Landfill Liner System."

#### **Review of Technical Documents**

With respect to the requested review of documents, the seismic and geotechnical analysis in the Original Draft EIR was based on the reports and documentation provided in the EIR. These documents have been available for public review, including Appendix C (Hydrogeologic Report for Chiquita Canyon Landfill) and Appendix D (Geotechnical Investigation for the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision), since July 10, 2014.

## Summary of Comments

- Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) have expressed concern regarding the
  increase in landfill-related traffic and its effect on Interstate 5 (I-5), State Route 126 (SR-126), and
  roadways within the City of Santa Clarita, cumulative traffic impacts of the Proposed Project, and
  methods used to evaluate the traffic impacts. The County prepared a Topical Response to these
  comments, which is included in the Final EIR<sup>1</sup> and also attached.
- Testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission also stated that comments received from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) were not sufficiently addressed.

## Applicant Rebuttal

- The assertion that traffic is a significant impact that must be mitigated is not supported by the traffic analysis. Specifically, the County concurs with the analysis and conclusions in the EIR that traffic impacts would be less than significant as a result of the Proposed Project.
- A comprehensive analysis of the project's potential traffic impacts was conducted and includes the following traffic-related documents:
  - Final EIR, Chapter 10, Traffic and Transportation
  - Appendix G1, Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), July 2014
  - Appendix G2, Traffic Supplement, November 2016 (discusses the clarified project baseline and provides a revised site entrance queuing analysis)
  - Appendix G3, Traffic Technical Data (from the TIA and additional analysis related to Caltrans' comments)
- Substantial additional analysis was prepared to address Caltrans' concerns with potential impacts to SR-126 and I-5. Detailed individual responses to these comments are provided following Caltrans comment letters (see Volume 2 of the Final EIR for responses to Caltrans Letters #24 and #390).

### Scope and Methodology

- The scope of the traffic analysis was prepared in accordance with direction provided by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW), Traffic and Lighting Division staff. The signed Memorandum of Understanding, which outlines the agreed upon scope of the traffic analysis, is provided in Appendix A of the TIA. The methods used satisfy both the requirements of LACDPW, as well as the Traffic Impact requirements of the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP). Traffic and Lighting also provided comments throughout the EIR process. In response to their comments, a Traffic Supplement was prepared (Appendix G2).
- The traffic impacts have been evaluated based on industry standards and include estimating the number of Proposed Project trips, distributing those trips across the surrounding road network, and evaluating the impacts to the surrounding roadways and intersections. In general the following was conducted:
  - Peak-hour intersection level of service (LOS) analysis for eight study intersections and five traffic scenarios (Existing, Existing plus Growth with and without Project, and Existing plus Growth plus Other Development Conditions [Cumulative Conditions] with and without Project). The LOS

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact* Report. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL APPLICANT REBUTTAL TRAFFIC

analysis was conducted using two different methods to accommodate the requirements of both Caltrans and the County of Los Angeles. Neither the County nor Caltrans have disputed these methods.

- Analysis of the I-5 freeway, including the mainline and the I-5 off-ramps at SR-126.
- Queuing analyses for the main project site entrance, the Household Hazardous Waste Facility entrance, the SR-126/Wolcott Way intersection, and the I-5 off-ramps.
- The estimated number of project trips were converted to passenger car equivalents at a factor of 2.0 (i.e., the number of project trips were doubled to account for slower-moving truck traffic when evaluating the intersection and freeway operating conditions with the project-added traffic). This factor was agreed upon by Los Angeles County staff during the scoping process for the traffic report. Therefore, the analysis accounts for differences in effects of trucks versus passenger cars.

### Findings

- Caltrans has indicated that the Conditions of Approval as part of the Conditional Use Permit will address their requirements; in particular, Condition 77, which addresses the Chiquita Canyon Landfill Street Improvement Project".
- Based on the traffic analysis, the study roadways and intersections, including I-5 and SR-126, will continue to operate at an acceptable LOS with the project-added traffic. Furthermore, once the project-traffic is distributed beyond the local road network, the project-related impact is considered nominal because the number of trips represent such a small percentage of the overall traffic volume. The Proposed Project trips dispersed over a large area would not translate into a substantial increase in traffic. No noticeable impacts to the overall transportation system are anticipated.
- At the request of Caltrans, a freeway analysis was performed for the I-5 mainline, south of SR-126. Based on the analysis conducted the Proposed Project would not impact mainline I-5. The analysis shows that all northbound and southbound freeway segments on I-5 currently operate at an acceptable LOS during both peak hours and will continue to operate at an acceptable LOS with the project-added traffic.
- In response to Caltrans' statements that the majority of truck traffic exiting northbound I-5 and continuing westbound on SR-126 uses the right-most left-turn lane, vehicle classification counts (e.g., identifying the number of trucks versus vehicles) were collected for the northbound off-ramp. A queuing analysis was conducted for all traffic scenarios to reflect the lopsided stacking of trucks in the right-most left-turn lane. Review of the anticipated queue lengths shows that the peak-hour queue lengths do not exceed the available off-ramp storage in any of the five scenarios analyzed. There would be no back up of traffic onto the I-5 freeway or blocking of lanes.
- At the request of Caltrans, a queuing analysis was conducted regarding the adequacy of storage at the intersection of SR-126 and Wolcott Way to accommodate peak-hour traffic with the projectadded trips. The intersection analyses show that the projected queue lengths for the westbound rightturn lane and eastbound left-turn lane at SR-126 and Wolcott Way can be accommodated within the provided storage. There would be no spill-over onto SR-126.
- A queuing analysis of the new project entrance (to be re-located to the corner of Wolcott Way and Franklin Parkway) was conducted to ensure that projected CCL traffic will not queue through the Wolcott Way/Franklin Parkway intersection. The queuing analysis demonstrates that the storage provided at the new CCL entrance will easily be able to accommodate the projected number of vehicles arriving to the site throughout the day and will provide enough storage to accommodate

projected CCL traffic without queuing onto public roadways. The new entrance location and design will minimize the potential for queuing onto SR-126.

- Despite commenters' claims to the contrary, there have been no fatal accidents on SR-126 at the entrance to CCL as a result of trucks entering or exiting the site. The comments that traffic currently backs up for a mile or more on SR-126 are not substantiated by the existing traffic count data that was collected for the TIA.
- In case of scale malfunction, failure of the scale, or an emergency (all rare occurrences), projectrelated traffic will not need to queue onto Wolcott Way back to SR-126. CCL has backup power for the scales, and the ability to put inbound trucks on outbound scales and to store trucks on the landfill site if needed until scales are operational. These methods will ensure project-related traffic will not be required to queue onto Wolcott Way back to SR-126.
- In the vicinity of the project, the Newhall Land and Farming Company (NLF) developments will be built in the next 20 to 30 years. The NLF improvements on SR-126 include widening of SR-126 (between the Los Angeles County line and Commerce Center Drive) and intersection improvements at SR-126 and Wolcott Way. The improvements along SR-126 will be phased as various phases of the NLF developments are built out. A long-term future analysis of the SR-126/Wolcott Way intersection (with the proposed improvements) was done for the year 2045, at the request of Caltrans. By the year 2045, Phase 3 of the NLF improvements will be built. The analysis shows that the Proposed Project will not have a significant impact at the intersection of SR-126/Wolcott Way in the long-term future (Year 2045) based on the Los Angeles County CMP guidelines. There would be no cumulative impact with the project and the NFL developments.

## Attachments

- Final EIR Topical Response #25, Traffic
- Individual responses to Caltrans Comment Letters #24 and #390.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

## 25. Traffic

Comments have been received expressing concern regarding the increase in landfill-related traffic and its effect on Interstate (I) 5, State Route (SR) 126, and roadways within the City of Santa Clarita, cumulative traffic impacts of the Proposed Project, and methods used to evaluate the traffic impacts. The comments and responses have been organized into these topic areas. The responses below are based on the analysis and findings provided in the *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Traffic Impact Analysis* (TIA) (Appendix G of the Final Environmental Impact report [EIR]), Chapter 10, Traffic and Transportation, of the Final EIR, and additional information provided in the response to California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Comment Letter 24 and Comment Letter 390. Given the technical nature of the Caltrans comments received, individual responses to their comments are provided following Comment Letters 24 and 390.

## 25a. Interstate 5

### **Summary of Comments**

It was stated that while most of the Proposed Project traffic is expected to use I-5, there is no analysis of potential impacts to I-5. It was requested that the analysis include the potential impacts to I-5 mainline.

Several comments were made that the Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) should make payments to Caltrans for the wear and tear on I-5 and for added lanes on I-5. A comment was received stating concurrence with Los Angeles County Planning that traffic is a significant impact that must be mitigated, that the owner of CCL should be required to contribute to the Westside Bridge and Thoroughfare District to mitigate local impacts, and to contribute to I-5 mitigation funds for truck lanes. Concerns were raised about the impacts to Newhall Pass with the addition of more than 400 trucks each day. One commenter stated that the freeway from McBean to SR-126 is in poor condition and asked who will be responsible for the road conditions and repairs on I-5 and for the overcrowding of vehicles on I-5. One commenter raised concerns regarding the impacts of alternate traffic flow during snow closures of I-5. One commenter asked who is responsible for preventing car accidents from the number of trucks that will be coming through the Santa Clarita Valley.

### Response

### Mainline I-5 Analysis

Caltrans is the Reviewing Agency for traffic concerns on I-5. For detailed responses to their comments, please refer to Comment Letter 24 and Comment Letter 390 in the Final EIR. At the request of Caltrans, a freeway analysis was performed for the I-5 mainline. The analysis was performed for the I-5 freeway segments south of SR-126, as Proposed Project trips north of SR-126 are nominal (two trips travelling northbound on I-5 and two trips travelling southbound on I-5 in both peak hours). Based on the analysis conducted the Proposed Project would not impact mainline I-5.

In November 2016, Los Angeles County voters approved a sales tax ballot measure, the Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan (Measure M). Measure M is proposed to ease traffic congestion; expand rail and rapid bus systems; repave local streets, repair potholes and synchronize signals; make public transportation more accessible, convenient, and affordable for seniors, students, and the

disabled; earthquake-retrofit bridges; embrace technology and innovation; create jobs, reduce pollution, and generate local economic benefits; and provide accountability and transparency. As part of Measure M, the I-5 North Capacity Enhancements would add one truck lane, one HOV (carpool) lane, and auxiliary lanes (additional outside lanes extending between an on-ramp and a subsequent off-ramp) on I-5, between SR-14 and Lake Hughes Boulevard. The existing general purpose lanes would be maintained. The design phase is scheduled to occur from Summer 2016 to Winter 2018, with construction estimated to occur Spring 2019 through Winter 2022. These improvements, while unrelated to the Proposed Project, would contribute to overall traffic easing on I-5.

The Proposed Project would have no impact on Newhall Pass, because the Proposed Project trips represent such a small percentage of the overall freeway traffic. I-5 currently carries 193,000 average daily trips near the SR-14 junction. The project-added trips represent an approximately 0.5 percent increase in the daily traffic load. For more information, please see the responses to Comment Letter 24.

### **Off-Ramp Queuing Analysis**

In response to Caltrans' statements that a majority of the truck traffic exiting northbound I-5 and continuing westbound on SR-126 uses the right-most left-turn lane, vehicle classification counts were collected for the northbound approach to evaluate the existing traffic pattern. A queuing analysis was conducted for all scenarios to reflect the lopsided stacking of trucks in the right-most left-turn lane. Review of the anticipated 95th percentile queue lengths shows that the peak hour queue lengths do not exceed the available off-ramp storage in any of the five scenarios analyzed. For more information please see the responses to Comment Letter 24.

### **Mitigation of Impacts to State Facilities**

Caltrans has a standard formula for calculating a project's equitable share for mitigating traffic impacts to state facilities. While the Proposed Project does not result in a significant traffic impact based on Los Angeles County and Caltrans' traffic impact thresholds, CCL will consult with Caltrans requiring the payment of any necessary fees. Also, commercial vehicles are regulated by federal and state law. These regulations are primarily enforced by the California Air Resources Board (for vehicle emissions), the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) (for driver's licenses and vehicle registration), the California Highway Patrol (for inspections and highway safety and laws), and Caltrans (for permits and operations). Commercial vehicles are required to obtain transportation permits for truck travel on city, county, and state roadways. Trucks traveling on public roads pay fees specifically designed to fund road maintenance. For example, the DMV collects weight fees based on the gross weight of commercial vehicles. Therefore, the daily wear and tear on I-5 is partially mitigated through the payment of vehicle license and permit fees that are required to operate a commercial vehicle, such as those vehicles coming to and from CCL.

The assertion that traffic is a significant impact that must be mitigated is not supported by the TIA. Specifically, the County concurs with the analysis and conclusions in the EIR that traffic impacts would be less than significant as a result of the Proposed Project.

### **Snow Closures of I-5**

According to Caltrans, full closures of I-5 (near the grapevine) occur during the winter months an average of 3-5 times per year, and therefore are a relatively rare event. As noted above, the majority of the project traffic on I-5 is anticipated to be coming to and from south of SR-126 and not over the grapevine. Snow closures on I-5 have never been reported to be an issue for trucks destined for CCL. With regards to other vehicular traffic on I-5, it is not the responsibility of CCL to manage the effects of snow closures on I-5. However, the following information provides further discussion on snow closures

on I-5. Caltrans, in conjunction, with the California Highway Patrol and local partner agencies developed "Operation Snowflake" in response to the emergency snow closures on I-5. Operation Snowflake includes three phases of response. Phase 1 includes reporting and warning motorists that snow is falling on the grapevine. During Phase 2, the California Highway Patrol is pacing or escorting groups of motorists over the pass due to snow falling and sticking to the ground. Phase 3a means that I-5 is closed but detours are possible using Highway 58 and Highway 166. Phase 3b means that I-5 and Highway 58 are closed but detours are possible using Highway 166. Phase 3c means that I-5, Highway 58, and Highway 166 are closed but detours are possible using Highway 166. Phase 3c means that I-5, Highway 58, and Highway 166 are closed but detours are possible using Highway 166. Phase 3c means that I-5, Highway 58, and Highway 166 are closed but detours are possible using Highway 166. Phase 3c means that I-5, Highway 58, and Highway 166 are closed but detours are possible using Highway 166. Phase 3c means that I-5, Highway 58, and Highway 166 are closed but detours are possible using Highway 46 and 41 to U.S. 101, and Phase 3d means all local highways are closed and no detours are available around the grapevine. Operation Snowflake takes every measure possible to ensure the highest safety to motorists while also keeping vehicles moving as quickly as possible to minimize congestion on and around I-5.

### 25b. State Route 126

### **Summary of Comments**

It was requested that a description of the improvements under way at the Commerce Center Drive/SR-126 intersection be provided. Comments were raised regarding offsite queuing onto SR-126. One commenter stated that presently, at 6 a.m., one lane is blocked by trucks waiting to get onsite for about 1 mile. It was recommended that the SR-126 westbound right turn lane be extended and that the eastbound SR-126 left turn lane be studied to determine if the left turn pocket should also be extended. Concerns were raised about traffic flow near the entry of the landfill if there were an accident along SR-126. One commenter expressed concern regarding left hand turns across the highway and stated that there are numerous accidents due to trucks trying to cross SR-126. It was suggested that CCL provide plans to avoid queuing onto SR-126 and that additional storage should be provided on Franklin Parkway. Commenters stated that there should be a contingency plan in the event that the scale malfunctions. One commenter asked how truck traffic will be prevented from coming to the Hasley Canyon traffic circle and/or the intersection of Commerce Center Drive and Hasley Canyon. Caltrans noted that any modifications on or affecting state right-of-way will need an encroachment permit from Caltrans and early coordination with Caltrans is recommended.

### Response

### **Commerce Center/SR-126 Improvements**

The following text has been added to the TIA and Chapter 10 of the Final EIR describing the completed improvement project at Commerce Center Drive/SR-126: "The Commerce Center Drive/SR-126 improvement project included reconstructing the at-grade intersection into a grade-separated diamond interchange. Vehicles on SR-126 are able to travel uninterrupted through the Commerce Center Drive crossing and vehicles on Commerce Center Drive access SR-126 via signalized diamond interchange ramps on Commerce Center Drive."

### Offsite Queuing onto SR-126

At the request of Caltrans, a queuing analysis was conducted regarding the adequacy of storage at the intersection of SR-126 and Wolcott Way to accommodate peak hour traffic with the project-added trips. The intersection analyses show that the projected queue lengths for the westbound right-turn lane and eastbound left-turn lane at SR-126 and Wolcott Way can be accommodated within the provided storage. For more information please see the responses to Comment Letter 24.

### Current Impacts to SR-126-Entrance Relocation

The comment that traffic currently backs up for a mile or more on SR-126 is not substantiated by the existing traffic count data that was collected for the TIA. The Proposed Project will remove the existing CCL entrance which is currently located on SR-126 and construct a new entrance on the corner of Wolcott Way and Franklin Parkway, therefore minimizing potential for queuing onto SR-126.

A queuing analysis of the new project entrance was also included in the TIA and Chapter 10 to ensure that projected CCL traffic will not queue through the Wolcott Way/Franklin Parkway intersection. The analysis evaluated the potential queue based on the estimated number of inbound trash-related (disposal) truck trips and based on the estimated number of inbound trash-related (disposal) truck trips based on actual gate receipt data for the existing landfill operations. The queuing analysis demonstrates that the storage provided at the new CCL entrance will easily be able to accommodate the projected number of vehicles arriving to the site throughout the day and will provide enough storage to accommodate projected CCL traffic without queuing onto public roadways.

In addition to the analysis in the TIA and Chapter 10 of the Original Draft EIR, a Traffic Supplement, included in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, was prepared to evaluate queuing at the new Proposed Project site entrance using the clarified baseline for traffic. The Traffic Supplement demonstrated that the clarified baseline does not affect the findings from the queuing analysis in the TIA and Chapter 10 of the Original Draft EIR. Sufficient storage exists to accommodate the clarified baseline traffic. Therefore, no queuing onto SR-126 is anticipated to occur. The findings of the Traffic Supplement have been incorporated into the Traffic and Transportation chapter of the Final EIR and the Traffic Supplement is included in Appendix G of the Final EIR.

There have been no fatal accidents on SR-126 at the entrance to CCL as a result of trucks entering or exiting the site. The entrance relocation is not only designed to facilitate queuing, but to also enhance safety, as trucks will not be required to make a left hand turn from either SR-126 into the site or from the site onto SR-126. Rather, trucks will turn at a signalized intersection with ample turning lane storage.

### **Scale Malfunction**

In case of scale malfunction, failure of the scale, or an emergency, (all rare occurrences), project-related traffic will not need to queue onto Wolcott Way back to SR-126. CCL has backup power for the scales, the ability to put inbound trucks on outbound scales, and the ability to store trucks on the landfill site if needed until scales are operational. These methods will ensure project-related traffic will not be required to queue onto Wolcott Way back to SR-126.

### **Impacts to Hasley Canyon**

It is unlikely that a truck traveling southbound on I-5 would choose to exit at Hasley Canyon Road, turn left onto the Old Road, turn right onto Hasley Canyon Road/Commerce Center Drive, and turn right onto Franklin Parkway. Instead trucks will likely travel southbound on I-5 and exit at SR-126, which are both highways and designated truck routes. The route from I-5 to SR-126 is approximately 0.5 miles longer than exiting at Hasley Canyon Road, but significantly better suited for truck travel. As noted above, the number of project trips travelling to and from I-5, north of SR-126, is nominal, making it even more unlikely that the trucks would use Hasley Canyon Road.

## 25c. Impacts to the City of Santa Clarita

### **Summary of Comments**

The City of Santa Clarita raised concerns that the increase in daily traffic will cause increased traffic congestion and vehicular delay for residents and employees in the city, based on the project trip distribution of 85 percent to/from the south on I-5 and 7 percent to/from the east on Newhall Ranch Road. The city stated that a majority of the projected traffic increase will consist of trucks, which create more congestion than an equal number of smaller vehicles. The city noted that 16 percent of the increased traffic is projected to occur during the a.m. peak hour which will cause increased delay for motorists traveling southbound on I-5 through the Santa Clarita Valley. The city is requesting preferred disposal rates and priority access to the landfill to offset the anticipated effects on Santa Clarita Valley residents. The city is requesting that CCL partner with the city to implement the annual Bike to Work Day and Rideshare events. The city noted that a sponsorship from the landfill in the amount of \$5,000 for each event on an annual basis would assist the city with planning and promoting the events, educate local residents, and reduce overall traffic congestion.

Other commenters raised general concerns that impacts to the City of Santa Clarita when the I-5 closure at Newhall pass occurs were not evaluated. Commenters asked whether the trucks will be diverted through Santa Clarita or other areas during the Newhall Pass closure and if the SR-126 off-ramp is also closed.

### Response

### Traffic Impacts to City of Santa Clarita

As previously described, a freeway analysis was performed on I-5 freeway segments south of SR-126 (and included as a response to Comment Letter 24). South of SR-126, 64 trips will travel along northbound and southbound I-5 to/from SR-126 to access/leave CCL in the a.m. peak hour. It was assumed that all trips travelling to/from I-5, south of SR-126, would have origins or destinations south of Pico Canyon Road. The analysis shows that all northbound and southbound freeway segments on I-5 currently operate at an acceptable LOS during both peak hours and will continue to operate at an acceptable LOS during both peak hours and will continue to operate at an acceptable LOS under the Existing plus Growth and Existing plus Growth plus Other Development (cumulative) Conditions with the project-added traffic. There would be no impact through the Santa Clarita Valley. South of Pico Canyon Road, Proposed Project trips on I-5 would continue to decrease as vehicles leave I-5 for destinations east or west of I-5. As Proposed Project trips decrease south of Pico Canyon Road, their impact is considered nominal because they represent such a small percentage of the overall freeway traffic on I-5.

The estimated number of project trips were converted to passenger car equivalents at a factor of 2.0 (i.e. the number of project trips were doubled to account for slower moving truck traffic when evaluating the intersection and freeway operating conditions with the project-added traffic). This factor was agreed upon by Los Angeles County staff during the scoping process for the traffic report. Therefore, the analysis accounts for differences in effects of trucks versus passenger cars.

### Impacts to the City from Newhall Pass Closure

The Newhall Pass improvement project is complete and according to Caltrans, there are no scheduled future closures for Newhall Pass. For more information, see the responses to Comment Letter 24.

### **Disposal Rates and Priority Access**

In response to the City of Santa Clarita's request for preferred disposal rates and priority access, the EIR correctly determined that the project will not result in significant impacts to traffic and transportation that require mitigation. Therefore, there is no nexus to link the potential for significant traffic impacts to preferred disposal rates and priority access for the City of Santa Clarita. Any discussions between CCL and the City of Santa Clarita regarding preferred rates and priority access should be conducted outside of the environmental review process for the Proposed Project.

CCL is very supportive of the City's Bike to Work Day and Rideshare events, and is likely to provide financial sponsorship of those events. However, such sponsorship would be voluntary, not in response to a significant impact associated with traffic.

## 25d. Cumulative Traffic Impacts

### **Summary of Comments**

Caltrans stated that previous studies for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan development have identified improvements to SR-126 including widening it to 4 lanes in each direction through the segments next to CCL. The Master Plan revision should recognize future improvements to SR-126 and contribute to their implementation commensurate with its contribution of future traffic. It was stated that the cumulative traffic analysis (including queueing) should be revised to include all foreseeable development within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and in the Commerce Center area. It was stated that the Newhall Ranch Development will add 21,000 homes to the area and the Hunt Williams Residential Property, Tapia Ranch and the Palmer property will bring an additional 1,300 homes to the area. It was requested that a detailed study on the impact of the peak potential vehicle landfill trips be provided and that adding the traffic from CCL will put an additional burden on traffic. It was requested that a detailed study on the impact to commuters, delivery vehicles, mail trucks and business owners be provided.

### Response

At the request of Caltrans, an analysis of the future improvement along SR-126 in conjunction with the proposed Newhall Land and Farm (NLF) developments has been conducted. The supplemental analysis evaluates the potential peak number of landfill vehicle trips added to the surrounding roadways. However, it is infeasible to categorize the potential impacts by user (e.g. impacts to commuters versus mail trucks). The analysis shows that there would be no significant traffic impact to any vehicles travelling on SR-126 or I-5 or through the intersections along these roadways. For more information, see the responses to Comment Letter 24.

In the vicinity of the project, the NLF developments will be built in the next 20 to 30 years. The NLF improvements on SR-126 include widening of SR-126 (between Los Angeles County line and Commerce Center Drive) and intersection improvements at SR-126 and Wolcott Way. The improvements along SR-126 will be phased as various phases of the NLF developments are built out. A long-term future analysis of the SR-126/Wolcott Way intersection (with the proposed improvements) was done for the year 2045, also at the request of Caltrans. By the year 2045, Phase 3 of the NLF improvements will be built. The analysis shows that the Proposed Project will not have a significant impact at the intersection of SR-126/Wolcott Way in the long-term future (Year 2045) based on the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) guidelines. For more information, see the responses to Comment Letter 24.

## 25e. Methodology

### **Summary of Comments**

Specific comments were made regarding the methodology used and the calculations presented in the traffic analysis. It was suggested that the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodologies be combined so that it paints a more realistic picture of the need for things such as a signal at Chiquito Canyon Road/SR-126, etc. One commenter stated that all calculations should be redone if the latest version of the HCM method was not used and revised according to any changes or updates to the HCM method.

Commenters requested clarification on how the number of inbound vehicles was calculated, whether the numbers represent vehicles per hour, and if there will be more peak hours where there will be 200 to 300 trucks per lane per hour. It was stated that the traffic study does not account for the haul trucks for daily cover. One comment requested that the source of traffic that would be considered "Other" outbound traffic in Tables 2-3 to 2-5 in Chapter 2, Project Description, be identified and to clarify whether the outbound trucks include those hauling leachate, household hazardous waste from the Household Hazardous Waste Facility, compost materials, and comingled recyclables.

Commenters requested clarification on what constitutes "morning and evening peak hours" and what "Other Development Conditions" includes. It was requested that the Newhall Ranch Development be included if it was not already.

One commenter requested that the mileage from CCL to all current clients (ranging all the way from Orange County to Santa Clarita) be added to further illustrate traffic impacts. It was suggested that if more clients from further away are sending more waste in the event of an expansion, the traffic impact is considerably expanded as well. It was suggested that the idling time should be recalculated to a realistic formula. The commenter stated that it is not possible to inform trucks that they can only idle for 2, 3.5, or 5 minutes when they are stuck on the SR-126/I-5 corridor.

### Response

### **Scope of Traffic Analysis**

The scope of the analysis in the TIA and Chapter 10, Traffic and Transportation, is in accordance with direction provided by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW), Traffic and Lighting Division staff. The signed Memorandum of Understanding, which outlines the agreed upon scope of the traffic analysis, is provided in Appendix A of the TIA. The methods used satisfy both the requirements of LACDPW, as well as the Traffic Impact requirements of the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan.

### Highway Capacity Manual and Intersection Capacity Utilization Methodology

Traffic analysis for the intersections was conducted using the HCM and the ICU methodologies to satisfy the requirements of both Caltrans and the County. Caltrans uses the HCM methodology for intersection analysis. The HCM methodology assesses LOS based on average delay per vehicle. The delay is calculated using peak hourly traffic volumes, peak hour factors, number of lanes, type of operation (signalized or unsignalized), and other factors. For this study, the most current version of the HCM methodology provides a comparison of the number of vehicles actually passing through an intersection during a given hour to the theoretical hourly vehicular capacity of that intersection. A saturation flow rate of 1,600 vehicles/hour/lane for all through/turn lanes and 2,880 vehicles/hour/lane for all dual turn lanes

was used in the ICU calculation, consistent with the guidance provided in the Los Angeles County CMP. The ICU calculation returns a volume-to-capacity ratio that translates into a corresponding LOS. For comparison purposes, both the HCM and ICU analysis values are reported in the summary tables. However, consistent with the CMP guidelines, all impacts are assessed using the ICU methodology only.

### Inbound/Outbound Vehicles

Tables 2-3 and 2-4 of the Original Draft EIR Chapter 2, Project Description, detailed the traffic associated with the Proposed Project, including daily inbound and outbound traffic to the site. In coordination with LACDPW, the baseline condition for the Proposed Project was revised, and the baseline traffic condition now includes all inbound and outbound vehicles. Tables 2-3 and 2-4 of Chapter 2, Project Description of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR presents the peak daily total and average daily total, respectively, for inbound material associated with the Proposed Project. Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR provides a detailed discussion of the assumptions used to establish the baseline condition and Chapter 10, Traffic and Transportation has been revised to reflect the change in baseline conditions.

Table 10-9 of Draft EIR Chapter 10, Traffic and Transportation shows the hourly vehicle distribution for a typical day based on historical gate information. It is assumed that the project-related trips would have a similar distribution pattern as for existing operations. It is not clear how the commenter calculated that there would be 200 to 300 trucks per lane per hour. This is incorrect. Based on the estimated peak project trip generation, there would be a two-hour period when there would be 200 to 300 total incoming vehicles. This is a conservative estimate because the maximum number of trash vehicles in each category is not anticipated to happen simultaneously. Furthermore, this original analysis assumes a significantly higher number of baseline trips than were subsequently analyzed in the Traffic Supplement, at the request of Los Angeles County.

### Peak Hour

Traffic studies typically focus on the "peak-hour" traffic volume in evaluating roadway and intersection conditions because it represents the most critical time period when traffic volume is at its highest. The peak hour usually coincides with the morning and evening rush hour which typically occurs sometime between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. and again in the evening between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. For the TIA, traffic counts were collected at the study intersections during these hours. Specifically, the peak "hour" represents the highest consecutive four 15-minute periods within the two-hour count period. The intersection LOS was evaluated based on the peak hour traffic volume for each intersection.

### **Other Development Conditions**

"Other Development Conditions" includes the projects identified in Section 3.2.9, Cumulative Impacts of the Original Draft EIR Chapter 3, General Setting and Resource Area Analysis. These projects represent the cumulative projects in the same vicinity and timeframe of the Proposed Project, and include the Newhall Ranch developments. For additional information on the issue of cumulative impacts, please see the master responses for each resource area.

### **Evaluation of Mileage to All Clients**

The request to evaluate the mileage from CCL to all current clients to further illustrate traffic impacts is not warranted. The Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Chapter 11, Air Quality, addresses the potential air quality impacts based on the estimated distance of travel for project-related trips. However, the traffic impacts have been evaluated based on industry standards and include estimating the number of Proposed Project trips, distributing those trips across the surrounding road network, and evaluating the local impacts to the surrounding roadways and intersections. While the Proposed Project may result in more vehicle miles travelled, most of the vehicles will be widely distributed, with no concentrations of vehicles occurring, except at the site. Once distributed beyond the local road network, the project-related impact is considered nominal because the number of trips represent such a small percentage of the overall traffic volume. The Proposed Project trips dispersed over a large area would not translate into a substantial increase in traffic. No noticeable impacts to the overall transportation system are anticipated. Furthermore, individual effects across the region cannot not be identified with certainty and are therefore not warranted.

### Idling on SR-126

It is not anticipated that trucks will be delayed on the SR-126/I-5 corridor. Based on TIA analyses, the study roadways and intersections, including I-5 and SR-126, will continue to operate at an acceptable LOS with the project-added traffic. Based on the historical gate receipt data, the average wait time at the scales is one minute per vehicle and there is sufficient storage onsite to accommodate the projected number of entering vehicles.

Furthermore, the California Air Resources Board implements vehicle idling regulations for heavy-duty diesel vehicles with a Gross Vehicle Weight Rating of 10,000 pounds or heavier. Per state law (California Code of Regulations, Section 2449[d][2]), idling for more than 5 minutes is generally prohibited. However, idling is allowed under the following situations:

- When the vehicle is stuck in traffic
- When idling is necessary to inspect or service the vehicle
- When operating a power take-off device
- When the vehicle cannot move due to adverse weather conditions or mechanical failure
- When the vehicle is queuing (must be beyond 100 feet from any residential area)
- When the truck's engine meets the optional low-nitrogen oxide idling emission standard, and is located more than 100 feet from any residential area (clean-idle label required)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION **DISTRICT 7-OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING** 100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012 PHONE (213) 897-9140 FAX (213) 897-1337 www.dot.ca.gov

August 25, 2014

Ms. Iris Chi County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

> **Re: Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision** Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) SCH#2005081071, IGR#140715/EA Vic: LA /126/0.00 - 5.00

Dear Ms. Chi:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) included in the DEIR prepared for the proposed Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) Master Plan Revision. Proposed Master Plan revisions include extension of existing waste footprint from 257 to approximately 400 acres, continue operation of the landfill, increase disposal limits, acceptance of all nonhazardous wastes permitted at a class III solid waste landfill, development of a Household Hazardous Waste Facility, and a mixed organics composting operation. The project site is located approximately three miles west of I-5 and north of State Route 126 (SR-126).

Based on a review of the Traffic and Transportation section, Caltrans has the following comments:

According to the transportation chapter (Table 10-8), the proposed project would generate a net increase of approximately 2,332 average daily vehicle trips during weekdays with 594 occurring in the AM peak hour and 1166 in the PM peak hour. A passenger car equivalent factor of 2.0 was used to convert truck trips to passenger car equivalents. Only the intersection of Commerce Center Drive and SR-126 is anticipated to be temporarily impacted 24-1 significantly utilizing Los Angeles County CMP guidelines. This intersection is currently under construction as part of the Commerce Center Drive/SR-126 improvement project, which is scheduled to be complete in 2016. Please include a description of improvements under way at this intersection.

Caltrans is concerned with potential adverse impacts to the northbound I-5 off-ramp to SR-. 126. Caltrans staff observed long queues of trucks, during the AM peak period, occurring in the third left-turn lane. Any additional trucks queuing in the left-turn lane may potentially



Serious drought.

Help save water!

EDMUND G. BROWN

block the right turn lane, thus creating a safety hazard. As a temporary measure, Caltrans plans to lengthen all left and right turn pockets an additional 200 feet. A more comprehensive (or long term) solution should be investigated for this off-ramp to accommodate future development on the Westside areas (west of I-5) and the additional trucks traffic to the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Caltrans recommends the CCL Master Plan revision is conditioned to contribute funding towards the planned temporary improvement at I-5 northbound off-ramp to SR-126. Caltrans does not concur with the queuing analysis done for this off-ramp as it concludes that sufficient storage is available.

- Most of the traffic (85%) is expected to come to or from I-5 however, there is no analysis of potential impacts to I-5. Please include analysis of potential impacts to I-5 mainline and inform about planned improvements such as the truck climbing lanes on the Newhall pass.
- The Master Plan revision proposes to relocate the entrance to the landfill to the Walcott Way and Franklin Parkway. This relocation will bring more heavy duty trucks to Walcott Way and SR-126 intersection. To address any potential conflicts between slow truck trying to make the right turn and fast moving through traffic, extension of the right turn lane is recommended. The westbound SR-126 left turn into Walcott Way should be studied in more detail to determine if the left turn pocket should also be extended.
- The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) only projects to 2015 even though the CCL is seeking a permit to continue operations for 20 to 30 years. Previous studies for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan development have identified improvements to SR-126 including widening it to 4 lanes in each direction through the segments next to the CCL site. The CCL Master Plan revision should recognize future improvements to SR-126 and contribute to their implementation commensurate with its contribution of future traffic. For a more appropriate cumulative transportation analysis, it is recommended that the TIA is revised to include all foreseeable development within Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and in the Commerce Center area. All queuing analysis should be revised accordingly.
- The report makes the assumption that scales will process one truck per minute; there should be a contingency plan in place in the event that the scale malfunctions. Please make necessary plans to avoid truck queuing on Walcott Way back to SR-126. Perhaps additional storage parking should be provided on Franklin Parkway. Please modify Figure 7-2 to clearly show the two storage lanes and the 900 feet distance prior before the scales.
- Any modifications on or affecting State right-of-way will need an encroachment permit from Caltrans. Please require that any modifications to right-of-way on or adjacent to SR-126 are coordinated with Caltrans early. Please be aware that redirection of storm water run-off onto State right-of-way is generally not permitted.

24-2 cont'd

24-3

24-4

24-5

24-6

24-7

Ms. Iris Chi August 25, 2014 Page 3

If you have any questions about these comments, you may contact Elmer Alvarez, project coordinator at (213) 897-6696 or me at (213)897-9140.

Sincerely,

-Wator

DÌANNA WATSON IGR/CEQA Branch Chief

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

## Letter No. 24

Dianna Watson Department of Transportation District 7-Office of Transportation Planning 100 S. Main Street, MS 16 Los Angeles, CA 90012

## Response to Comment No. 24-1

A description of the completed improvements at the intersection of Commerce Center Drive/State Route 126 (SR-126) has been added to the Final EIR. Construction of the Commerce Center Drive/SR-126 improvement project was completed in Fall 2016, and included reconstructing the at-grade intersection into a grade-separated diamond interchange. Vehicles on SR-126 are able to travel uninterrupted through the Commerce Center Drive crossing, and vehicles on Commerce Center Drive access SR-126 via signalized diamond interchange ramps on Commerce Center Drive.

## Response to Comment No. 24-2

### I-5 Off-Ramp Queueing Analysis

Caltrans has reported that existing traffic patterns show that a majority of the truck traffic exiting northbound Interstate 5 (I-5) and continuing onto westbound SR-126 uses the right-most left-turn lane. Existing vehicle classification counts were collected for the northbound approach and are provided in Appendix G-3. Figure 24-1 illustrates the summary of the vehicle classification data for the northbound approach on the I-5 northbound off-ramp at SR-126. As shown in Figure 24-1, the data support the claims that Caltrans reported. In the a.m. peak hour, 89.4 percent of the trucks exiting the I-5 northbound off-ramp use the outside left-turn lane (left-turn lane 3). In the p.m. peak hour, 67.5 percent of the trucks exiting the I-5 northbound off-ramp use the outside left-turn lane.

Queue lengths at the northbound and southbound I-5 off-ramps were examined to evaluate whether or not adequate storage is available to accommodate peak-hour traffic with the Proposed Project. Table 24-1 reports the available I-5 northbound and southbound off-ramp storage at SR-126 and the anticipated queue lengths for the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing plus Growth (2015) Conditions without Project
- Existing plus Growth (2015) plus Other Development Conditions without Project
- Existing plus Growth (2015) Conditions with Project
- Existing plus Growth (2015) plus Other Development Conditions with Project

The amount of truck traffic in each lane (as summarized in Figure 24-1), was inserted into the Synchro models for all scenarios to ensure that the queueing analysis accounted for the lopsided stacking of trucks in the right-most left-turn lane. The queue lengths reported in Table 24-1 represent the 95th percentile queue length as calculated in Synchro. The worse peak-hour queue length is reported. Review of the anticipated 95th percentile queue lengths shows that the peak-hour queue lengths do not exceed the available off-ramp storage in any of the five scenarios analyzed. In addition, the Proposed Project will only cause a slight increase (less than 10 feet) in the queue length in the Existing plus Growth plus Other Development plus Project conditions (based on Synchro analysis). Closer review of the queuing analysis also shows that the northbound off-ramp queues reported in Table 24-1 are driven by the right-turn lane and not the left-turn lanes. In all scenarios, the right-turn lane queue on the northbound off-ramp was projected to be the longest queue length. Therefore, the increase in truck traffic due to the project has no effect on the longest queue on the
northbound off-ramp, because the longest queue does not change in volume with the Proposed Project (the northbound right-turn movement).



Figure 24-1. I-5 Northbound Off-Ramp at SR-126, Vehicle Classification Summary

#### Table 24-1. Interstate 5 Off-Ramp Queue Analysis at State Route 126

Chiquita Canyon Landfill Final EIR

|  | I-5 Southbound off-ramp and SR-126 | I-5 Northbound off-ramp and SR-126 |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Available Off-Ramp Storage Length (ft)                                     | 1,600                              | 1,300                              |
| Existing Conditions Queue Length (ft)                                      | 237                                | 548                                |
| Existing plus Growth Queue Length (ft)                                     | 281                                | 524                                |
| Existing plus Growth plus Other Development Queue Length (ft)              | 303                                | 534                                |
| Existing plus Growth plus Project Queue Length (ft)                        | 281                                | 525                                |
| Existing plus Growth plus Other Development plus Project Queue Length (ft) | 311                                | 534                                |

## Response to Comment No. 24-3

#### I-5 Mainline Analysis

The majority of the Proposed Project traffic (85 percent) will travel to CCL via I-5. Figures 10-7 and 10-8 in Chapter 10 of the Final EIR, illustrate the distribution of trips. South of SR-126, 64 trips will travel along northbound and southbound I-5 to/from SR-126 to access/leave CCL in the a.m. peak hour. In the p.m. peak hour south of SR-126, 65 trips will travel along northbound and southbound I-5 to/from SR-126 to access/leave the site. North of SR-126, there will only be two trips traveling along northbound and southbound I-5 to/from SR-126 to access/leave the site in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Freeway analysis of I-5 was conducted to understand the effects of project traffic on I-5. The freeway analysis compares volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios for the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing plus Growth (2015) Conditions without Project
- Existing plus Growth (2015) plus Other Development Conditions without Project
- Existing plus Growth (2015) Conditions with Project
- Existing plus Growth (2015) plus Other Development Conditions with Project

The freeway analysis was performed on I-5 freeway segments south of SR-126 as project trips north of SR-126 are nominal (two trips on northbound and southbound I-5 in both peak hours). The freeway analysis was based on the following assumptions/inputs:

- Existing freeway traffic data were based on the Caltrans Freeway Performance Measurement System and Caltrans Census Data.
- The lane geometry assumptions for each study segment are based on existing conditions.
- The capacity of general purpose lanes was assumed to be 2,000 vehicles/hour/lane.
- The capacity of auxiliary lanes was assumed to be 1,000 vehicles/hour/lane.
- It was assumed that all trips travelling to/from I-5, south of SR-126, would have origins or destinations south of Pico Canyon Road. South of Pico Canyon Road, project trips on I-5 would decrease as vehicles leave I-5 for destinations east or west of I-5. As the analysis will show, as project trips decrease south of Pico Canyon Road, their impact is considered nominal because they represent such a small percentage of the overall freeway traffic on I-5.
- All project trips are assumed to travel in the general purpose lanes on I-5 since truck traffic is not allowed in the high occupancy vehicle lanes.

The results of the I-5 Mainline analysis are summarized in Tables 24-2 through 24-6 as follows. Table 24-2 summarizes the Existing Condition freeway operations (V/C ratios). Under Existing Conditions, all northbound and southbound freeway segments on I-5 in the study area operate with a V/C ratio less than 0.80 in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Table 24-3 summarizes the Existing plus Growth without Project Condition freeway operations (V/C ratios). Under Existing plus Growth without Project Conditions, all northbound and southbound freeway segments on I-5 in the study area will operate with a V/C ratio of 0.80 or less in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Table 24-4 summarizes the Existing plus Growth plus Other Development without Project Condition freeway operations (V/C ratios). Under Existing plus Growth plus Other Development without Project Conditions, all northbound and southbound freeway segments on I-5 in the study area will operate with a V/C ratio of 0.82 or less in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Table 24-5 summarizes the Existing plus Growth with Project Condition freeway operations (V/C ratios). Table 24-5 also compares Existing plus Growth with and without Project Conditions on I-5. Under Existing plus Growth with Project Conditions, all northbound and southbound freeway segments on I-5 in the study area will operate with a V/C ratio of 0.81 or less in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. In addition, the Proposed Project will not increase the V/C ratio of any study segment by more than 1 percent.

Table 24-6 summarizes the Existing plus Growth plus Other Development with Project Condition freeway operations (V/C ratios). Table 24-6 also compares Existing plus Growth plus Other Development with and without Project Conditions on I-5. Under Existing plus Growth plus Other Development with Project Conditions, all northbound and southbound freeway segments on I-5 in the study area will operate with a V/C ratio of 0.83 or less in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. In addition, the Proposed Project will not increase the V/C ratio of any study segment by more than 1 percent.

| Table 24-2. I-5 Freewa | ay Operationa | al Summary – | <ul> <li>Existing</li> </ul> | Conditions |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|

|   |   |    |   |            |          |           |            | AM Peak<br>Volume | Hour        | PM Peak<br>Volume | Hour        |
|---|---|----|---|------------|----------|-----------|------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|
|   | Freeway Segment                           |    |   | HOV Lanes* | GP Lanes | Aux Lanes | Capacity** | (veh/hour)**      | V/C Ratio** | (veh/hour)**      | V/C Ratio** |
|   | Northbound I-5                            |    |   |            |          |           |            |                   |             |                   |             |
|   | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | to | SR-126 off-ramp                           | 0          | 4        | 1         | 9,000      | 3,291             | 0.37        | 3,903             | 0.43        |
| - | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,046             | 0.38        | 3,561             | 0.45        |
| 2 | Valencia Blvd on-ramp                     | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 1         | 9,000      | 3,838             | 0.43        | 4,670             | 0.52        |
| 2 | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | to | Valencia Blvd on-ramp                     | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 2,730             | 0.34        | 3,388             | 0.42        |
| 5 | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | to | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4        | 1         | 9,000      | 3,363             | 0.37        | 4,274             | 0.47        |
|   | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | to | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,279             | 0.41        | 4,157             | 0.52        |
|   | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | to | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,137             | 0.39        | 3,958             | 0.49        |
| 5 | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons on-ramp              | to | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,634             | 0.45        | 4,653             | 0.58        |
| 2 | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons off-ramp             | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons on-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,109             | 0.39        | 3,919             | 0.49        |
|   | Calgrove Blvd on-ramp                     | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons off-ramp             | 1          | 4        | 1         | 9,000      | 3,929             | 0.44        | 5,067             | 0.56        |
|   | Southbound I-5                            |    |   |            |          |           |            |                   |             |                   |             |
|   | SR-126 on-ramp                            | to | The Old Rd off-ramp                       | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 2,382             | 0.30        | 3,147             | 0.39        |
|   | The Old Rd off-ramp                       | to | The Old Rd on-ramp                        | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 2,280             | 0.29        | 3,045             | 0.38        |
|   | The Old Rd on-ramp                        | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 2,941             | 0.37        | 3,706             | 0.46        |
|   | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 2,683             | 0.34        | 3,448             | 0.43        |
| ۵ | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | to | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,140             | 0.39        | 3,905             | 0.49        |
|   | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | to | Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp                | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 2,949             | 0.37        | 3,714             | 0.46        |
| 5 | Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp                | to | Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp            | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,816             | 0.48        | 5,141             | 0.64        |
|   | Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp            | to | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,218             | 0.53        | 5,428             | 0.68        |
|   | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | to | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,984             | 0.50        | 5,194             | 0.65        |
| 5 | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | to | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,449             | 0.56        | 5,478             | 0.68        |
| ) | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp         | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,660             | 0.58        | 5,689             | 0.71        |
|   | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp         | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp     | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,388             | 0.55        | 5,417             | 0.68        |
| L | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp     | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,641             | 0.58        | 5,670             | 0.71        |
|   | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp | to | Calgrove Blvd off-ramp                    | 1          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 5,055             | 0.63        | 6,084             | 0.76        |

\* HOV lane geometry reported for reference only. Project/truck traffic is not permitted in HOV lanes and is therefore not a focus of the freeway analysis to assess project impacts.

#### Table 24-3. I-5 Freeway Operational Summary – Existing plus Growth without Project Conditions

|    |   |    |   |            |                 |           |            | AM Peak      | Hour        | PM Peak                | Hour        |
|----|---|----|---|------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|
|    | Freeway Segment                           |    |   | HOV Lanes* | <b>GP</b> Lanes | Auxianes  | Canacity** | (veb/bour)** | V/C Ratio** | volume<br>(veb/bour)** | V/C Ratio** |
|    | Northbound I-5                            |    |   | HOV Lanes  | OF Lattes       | Aux Lanes | capacity   | (ven/nour/   | V/C Natio   | (ven/nour/             | V/C Natio   |
| ſ  | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | to | SR-126 off-ramp                           | 0          | 4               | 1         | 9.000      | 3.481        | 0.39        | 4.130                  | 0.46        |
| n, | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8.000      | 3.223        | 0.40        | 3.768                  | 0.47        |
| 5  | Valencia Blvd on-ramp                     | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 1         | 9.000      | 4.061        | 0.45        | 4.941                  | 0.55        |
|    | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | to | Valencia Blvd on-ramp                     | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8.000      | 2.888        | 0.36        | 3.584                  | 0.45        |
| 5  | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | to | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4               | 1         | 9.000      | 3,558        | 0.40        | 4.522                  | 0.50        |
|    | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | to | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8.000      | 3,469        | 0.43        | 4.398                  | 0.55        |
|    | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | to | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8.000      | 3,319        | 0.41        | 4,187                  | 0.52        |
|    | Pico Canvon Rd/Lyons on-ramp              | to | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8.000      | 3.844        | 0.48        | 4.923                  | 0.62        |
|    | Pico Canvon Rd/Lyons off-ramp             | to | Pico Canvon Rd/Lyons on-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8.000      | 3.289        | 0.41        | 4.146                  | 0.52        |
|    | Calgrove Blvd on-ramp                     | to | Pico Canvon Rd/Lyons off-ramp             | 1          | 4               | 1         | 9.000      | 4.157        | 0.46        | 5.361                  | 0.60        |
|    | Southbound I-5                            |    |   |            |                 |           | .,         | , -          |             | - /                    |             |
|    | SR-126 on-ramp                            | to | The Old Rd off-ramp                       | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 2,520        | 0.32        | 3,330                  | 0.42        |
|    | The Old Rd off-ramp                       | to | The Old Rd on-ramp                        | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 2,412        | 0.30        | 3,222                  | 0.40        |
|    | The Old Rd on-ramp                        | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,111        | 0.39        | 3,921                  | 0.49        |
| )  | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 2,839        | 0.35        | 3,648                  | 0.46        |
| 5  | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | to | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,322        | 0.42        | 4,131                  | 0.52        |
|    | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | to | Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp                | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,120        | 0.39        | 3,930                  | 0.49        |
| 5  | Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp                | to | Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp            | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,037        | 0.50        | 5,439                  | 0.68        |
|    | Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp            | to | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,463        | 0.56        | 5,743                  | 0.72        |
|    | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | to | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,215        | 0.53        | 5,495                  | 0.69        |
| 5  | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | to | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,707        | 0.59        | 5,796                  | 0.72        |
| •  | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp         | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,930        | 0.62        | 6,019                  | 0.75        |
|    | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp         | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp     | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,643        | 0.58        | 5,731                  | 0.72        |
| L  | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp     | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,911        | 0.61        | 5,999                  | 0.75        |
| /  | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp | to | Calgrove Blvd off-ramp                    | 1          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 5,348        | 0.67        | 6,437                  | 0.80        |

\* HOV lane geometry reported for reference only. Project/truck traffic is not permitted in HOV lanes and is therefore not a focus of the freeway analysis to assess project impacts.

| Table 24-4. I-5 Freeway | v Operational Summar | v – Existing plus Growth | plus Other Develo | pment without Pre | piect Conditions |
|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|                         |                      |                          |                   |                   |                  |

|    |   |    |   |            |          |           |            | AM Peak<br>Volume | Hour        | PM Peak<br>Volume | Hour        |
|----|---|----|---|------------|----------|-----------|------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|
|    | Freeway Segment                           |    |   | HOV Lanes* | GP Lanes | Aux Lanes | Capacity** | (veh/hour)**      | V/C Ratio** | (veh/hour)**      | V/C Ratio** |
|    | Northbound I-5                            |    |   |            |          |           |            |                   | -           |                   |             |
| Γ  | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | to | SR-126 off-ramp                           | 0          | 4        | 1         | 9,000      | 3,613             | 0.40        | 4,292             | 0.48        |
|    | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,355             | 0.42        | 3,930             | 0.49        |
| ۵. | Valencia Blvd on-ramp                     | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 1         | 9,000      | 4,193             | 0.47        | 5,103             | 0.57        |
|    | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | to | Valencia Blvd on-ramp                     | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,020             | 0.38        | 3,746             | 0.47        |
| 5  | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | to | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4        | 1         | 9,000      | 3,690             | 0.41        | 4,684             | 0.52        |
|    | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | to | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,601             | 0.45        | 4,560             | 0.57        |
|    | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | to | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,451             | 0.43        | 4,349             | 0.54        |
| 5  | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons on-ramp              | to | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,976             | 0.50        | 5,085             | 0.64        |
|    | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons off-ramp             | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons on-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,421             | 0.43        | 4,308             | 0.54        |
|    | Calgrove Blvd on-ramp                     | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons off-ramp             | 1          | 4        | 1         | 9,000      | 4,289             | 0.48        | 5,523             | 0.61        |
|    | Southbound I-5                            |    |   |            |          |           |            |                   |             |                   |             |
|    | SR-126 on-ramp                            | to | The Old Rd off-ramp                       | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 2,542             | 0.32        | 3,444             | 0.43        |
|    | The Old Rd off-ramp                       | to | The Old Rd on-ramp                        | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 2,434             | 0.30        | 3,336             | 0.42        |
|    | The Old Rd on-ramp                        | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,133             | 0.39        | 4,035             | 0.50        |
|    | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | to | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 2,861             | 0.36        | 3,762             | 0.47        |
|    | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | to | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,344             | 0.42        | 4,245             | 0.53        |
|    | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | to | Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp                | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 3,142             | 0.39        | 4,044             | 0.51        |
|    | Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp                | to | Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp            | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,059             | 0.51        | 5,553             | 0.69        |
|    | Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp            | to | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,485             | 0.56        | 5,857             | 0.73        |
|    | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | to | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,237             | 0.53        | 5,609             | 0.70        |
| 5  | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | to | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,729             | 0.59        | 5,910             | 0.74        |
| )  | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp         | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,952             | 0.62        | 6,133             | 0.77        |
|    | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp         | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp     | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,665             | 0.58        | 5,845             | 0.73        |
| L  | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp     | to | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp | 0          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 4,933             | 0.62        | 6,113             | 0.76        |
|    | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp | to | Calgrove Blvd off-ramp                    | 1          | 4        | 0         | 8,000      | 5,370             | 0.67        | 6,551             | 0.82        |

\* HOV lane geometry reported for reference only. Project/truck traffic is not permitted in HOV lanes and is therefore not a focus of the freeway analysis to assess project impacts.

#### Table 24-5. I-5 Freeway Operational Summary – Existing plus Growth with Project Conditions

|   |  |            |                 |           |            | 3            | xisting plus Gro | wth Conditions |             |              | Existing p | olus Growth pl | us Project Conditions | 5        |           |
|---|--|------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|
|   |  |            |                 |           |            | AM Peak H    | lour             | PM Peak        | Hour        | AM P         | Peak Hour  |                | PM P                  | eak Hour |           |
|   |  |            |                 |           |            | Volume       |                  | Volume         |             | Volume       | V/C        | V/C Ratio      | Volume                | V/C      | V/C Ratio |
| Freeway Segment                           |  | HOV Lanes* | <b>GP</b> Lanes | Aux Lanes | Capacity** | (veh/hour)** | V/C Ratio**      | (veh/hour)**   | V/C Ratio** | (veh/hour)** | Ratio**    | Increase       | (veh/hour)**          | Ratio**  | Increase  |
| Northbound I-5                            |  |            |                 |           |            |              |                  |                |             |              |            |                |                       |          |           |
| Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | to SR-126 off-ramp                           | 0          | 4               | 1         | 9,000      | 3,481        | 0.39             | 4,130          | 0.46        | 3,545        | 0.39       | 0.00           | 4,195                 | 0.47     | 0.01      |
| Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | to Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,223        | 0.40             | 3,768          | 0.47        | 3,287        | 0.41       | 0.01           | 3,833                 | 0.48     | 0.01      |
| Valencia Blvd on-ramp                     | to Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 1         | 9,000      | 4,061        | 0.45             | 4,941          | 0.55        | 4,125        | 0.46       | 0.01           | 5,006                 | 0.56     | 0.01      |
| Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | to Valencia Blvd on-ramp                     | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 2,888        | 0.36             | 3,584          | 0.45        | 2,952        | 0.37       | 0.01           | 3,649                 | 0.46     | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | to Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4               | 1         | 9,000      | 3,558        | 0.40             | 4,522          | 0.50        | 3,622        | 0.40       | 0.00           | 4,587                 | 0.51     | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | to McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,469        | 0.43             | 4,398          | 0.55        | 3,533        | 0.44       | 0.01           | 4,463                 | 0.56     | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | to McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,319        | 0.41             | 4,187          | 0.52        | 3,383        | 0.42       | 0.01           | 4,252                 | 0.53     | 0.01      |
| Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons on-ramp              | to McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,844        | 0.48             | 4,923          | 0.62        | 3,908        | 0.49       | 0.01           | 4,988                 | 0.62     | 0.00      |
| Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons off-ramp             | to Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons on-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,289        | 0.41             | 4,146          | 0.52        | 3,353        | 0.42       | 0.01           | 4,211                 | 0.53     | 0.01      |
| Calgrove Blvd on-ramp                     | to Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons off-ramp             | 1          | 4               | 1         | 9,000      | 4,157        | 0.46             | 5,361          | 0.60        | 4,221        | 0.47       | 0.01           | 5,426                 | 0.60     | 0.00      |
| Southbound I-5                            |  |            |                 |           |            |              |                  |                |             |              |            |                |                       |          |           |
| SR-126 on-ramp                            | to The Old Rd off-ramp                       | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 2,520        | 0.32             | 3,330          | 0.42        | 2,584        | 0.32       | 0.00           | 3,395                 | 0.42     | 0.00      |
| The Old Rd off-ramp                       | to The Old Rd on-ramp                        | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 2,412        | 0.30             | 3,222          | 0.40        | 2,476        | 0.31       | 0.01           | 3,287                 | 0.41     | 0.01      |
| The Old Rd on-ramp                        | to Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,111        | 0.39             | 3,921          | 0.49        | 3,175        | 0.40       | 0.01           | 3,986                 | 0.50     | 0.01      |
| Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | to Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 2,839        | 0.35             | 3,648          | 0.46        | 2,903        | 0.36       | 0.01           | 3,713                 | 0.46     | 0.00      |
| Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | to Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,322        | 0.42             | 4,131          | 0.52        | 3,386        | 0.42       | 0.00           | 4,196                 | 0.52     | 0.00      |
| Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | to Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp                | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 3,120        | 0.39             | 3,930          | 0.49        | 3,184        | 0.40       | 0.01           | 3,995                 | 0.50     | 0.01      |
| Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp                | to Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp            | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,037        | 0.50             | 5,439          | 0.68        | 4,101        | 0.51       | 0.01           | 5,504                 | 0.69     | 0.01      |
| Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp            | to McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,463        | 0.56             | 5,743          | 0.72        | 4,527        | 0.57       | 0.01           | 5,808                 | 0.73     | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | to McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,215        | 0.53             | 5,495          | 0.69        | 4,279        | 0.53       | 0.00           | 5,560                 | 0.69     | 0.00      |
| McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | to McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,707        | 0.59             | 5,796          | 0.72        | 4,771        | 0.60       | 0.01           | 5,861                 | 0.73     | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | to Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp         | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,930        | 0.62             | 6,019          | 0.75        | 4,994        | 0.62       | 0.00           | 6,084                 | 0.76     | 0.01      |
| Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp         | to Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp     | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,643        | 0.58             | 5,731          | 0.72        | 4,707        | 0.59       | 0.01           | 5,796                 | 0.72     | 0.00      |
| Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp     | to Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp | 0          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 4,911        | 0.61             | 5,999          | 0.75        | 4,975        | 0.62       | 0.01           | 6,064                 | 0.76     | 0.01      |
| Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp | to Calgrove Blvd off-ramp                    | 1          | 4               | 0         | 8,000      | 5,348        | 0.67             | 6,437          | 0.80        | 5,412        | 0.68       | 0.01           | 6,502                 | 0.81     | 0.01      |

\* HOV lane geometry reported for reference only. Project/truck traffic is not permitted in HOV lanes and is therefore not a focus of the freeway analysis to assess project impacts.

Table 24-6. I-5 Freeway Operational Summary – Existing plus Growth plus Other Development with Project Conditions

|  |   |            |           |            |            | Existing plus | Growth plus Oth | er Development Co | nditions    | Existing p   | lus Growth     | olus Other Dev | elopment plus Proje | ct Condition   | s         |
|--|---|------------|-----------|------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------|
|  |   |            |           |            |            | Alvi Pedk     | Hour            | Valuma            | nour        | Alvi P       |                | V/C Patia      |                     |                | V/C Datia |
| Erooway Sagmont                                |   |            | GRIanor   | Auxlanor   | Canacity** | (vob/bour)**  | V/C Patio**     | (vob/bour)**      | V/C Potio** | (vob/bour)** | V/C<br>Patio** |                | (vob/bour)**        | V/C<br>Patio** | V/C Kallo |
| Northbound L 5                                 |   | HOV Lattes | GF Lalles | Aux Lattes | capacity   | (ven/nour)    | V/C Ratio       | (ven/nour)        | V/C Ratio   | (ven/nour)   | Ratio          | merease        | (ven/nour)          | Katio          | Increase  |
| Magic Mountain Physic on-ramp to Si            | SB-126 off-ramp                           | 0          | 4         | 1          | 9.000      | 3 613         | 0.40            | 1 292             | 0.48        | 3 677        | 0.41           | 0.01           | 1 357               | 0.48           | 0.00      |
| Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp to M              | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 3 355         | 0.42            | 3 930             | 0.49        | 3 419        | 0.43           | 0.01           | 3 995               | 0.50           | 0.00      |
| Valencia Blvd on-ramp to M                     | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4         | 1          | 9,000      | 4 193         | 0.47            | 5,550             | 0.57        | 4 257        | 0.47           | 0.00           | 5 168               | 0.50           | 0.00      |
| Valencia Blvd off-ramp to V                    | Valencia Blvd on-ramp                     | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 3 0 2 0       | 0.38            | 3 746             | 0.47        | 3 084        | 0.39           | 0.00           | 3,200               | 0.48           | 0.00      |
| McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp to V              | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4         | 1          | 9,000      | 3 690         | 0.41            | 4 684             | 0.52        | 3 754        | 0.42           | 0.01           | 4 749               | 0.53           | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp to N                  | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8.000      | 3,601         | 0.45            | 4,560             | 0.57        | 3,665        | 0.46           | 0.01           | 4.625               | 0.58           | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy off-ramp to N                      | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8.000      | 3.451         | 0.43            | 4,349             | 0.54        | 3.515        | 0.44           | 0.01           | 4.414               | 0.55           | 0.01      |
| Pico Canvon Rd/Lyons on-ramp to N              | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8.000      | 3,976         | 0.50            | 5.085             | 0.64        | 4,040        | 0.51           | 0.01           | 5.150               | 0.64           | 0.00      |
| Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons off-ramp to P             | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons on-ramp              | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 3,421         | 0.43            | 4,308             | 0.54        | 3,485        | 0.44           | 0.01           | 4,373               | 0.55           | 0.01      |
| Calgrove Blvd on-ramp to P                     | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons off-ramp             | 1          | 4         | 1          | 9,000      | 4,289         | 0.48            | 5,523             | 0.61        | 4,353        | 0.48           | 0.00           | 5,588               | 0.62           | 0.01      |
| Southbound I-5                                 | , , , , , ,                               |            |           |            |            |               |                 |                   |             |              |                |                |                     |                |           |
| SR-126 on-ramp to T                            | The Old Rd off-ramp                       | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 2,542         | 0.32            | 3,444             | 0.43        | 2,606        | 0.33           | 0.01           | 3,509               | 0.44           | 0.01      |
| The Old Rd off-ramp to T                       | The Old Rd on-ramp                        | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 2,434         | 0.30            | 3,336             | 0.42        | 2,498        | 0.31           | 0.01           | 3,401               | 0.43           | 0.01      |
| The Old Rd on-ramp to N                        | Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp              | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 3,133         | 0.39            | 4,035             | 0.50        | 3,197        | 0.40           | 0.01           | 4,100               | 0.51           | 0.01      |
| Magic Mountain Pkwy off-ramp to N              | Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp               | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 2,861         | 0.36            | 3,762             | 0.47        | 2,925        | 0.37           | 0.01           | 3,827               | 0.48           | 0.01      |
| Magic Mountain Pkwy on-ramp to V               | Valencia Blvd off-ramp                    | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 3,344         | 0.42            | 4,245             | 0.53        | 3,408        | 0.43           | 0.01           | 4,310               | 0.54           | 0.01      |
| Valencia Blvd off-ramp to V                    | Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp                | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 3,142         | 0.39            | 4,044             | 0.51        | 3,206        | 0.40           | 0.01           | 4,109               | 0.51           | 0.00      |
| Valencia Blvd loop on-ramp to V                | Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp            | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 4,059         | 0.51            | 5,553             | 0.69        | 4,123        | 0.52           | 0.01           | 5,618               | 0.70           | 0.01      |
| Valencia Blvd diagonal on-ramp to N            | McBean Pkwy off-ramp                      | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 4,485         | 0.56            | 5,857             | 0.73        | 4,549        | 0.57           | 0.01           | 5,922               | 0.74           | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy off-ramp to N                      | McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp                  | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 4,237         | 0.53            | 5,609             | 0.70        | 4,301        | 0.54           | 0.01           | 5,674               | 0.71           | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy loop on-ramp to N                  | McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp              | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 4,729         | 0.59            | 5,910             | 0.74        | 4,793        | 0.60           | 0.01           | 5,975               | 0.75           | 0.01      |
| McBean Pkwy diagonal on-ramp to P              | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp         | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 4,952         | 0.62            | 6,133             | 0.77        | 5,016        | 0.63           | 0.01           | 6,198               | 0.77           | 0.00      |
| Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave off-ramp to P         | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp     | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 4,665         | 0.58            | 5,845             | 0.73        | 4,729        | 0.59           | 0.01           | 5,910               | 0.74           | 0.01      |
| Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave loop on-ramp to P     | Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp | 0          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 4,933         | 0.62            | 6,113             | 0.76        | 4,997        | 0.62           | 0.00           | 6,178               | 0.77           | 0.01      |
| Pico Canyon Rd/Lyons Ave diagonal on-ramp to C | Calgrove Blvd off-ramp                    | 1          | 4         | 0          | 8,000      | 5,370         | 0.67            | 6,551             | 0.82        | 5,434        | 0.68           | 0.01           | 6,616               | 0.83           | 0.01      |

\* HOV lane geometry reported for reference only. Project/truck traffic is not permitted in HOV lanes and is therefore not a focus of the freeway analysis to assess project impacts.

#### Newhall Pass

The Proposed Project would have no impact on Newhall Pass because the project trips represent such a small percentage of the overall freeway traffic. I-5 currently carries 193,000 average daily trips near the SR-14 junction. The project-added trips represent an approximately 0.5 percent increase in the daily traffic load. Furthermore, the I-5 improvement project on Newhall Pass was completed in December 2014, which provides added capacity and safety to this segment of I-5. The project, which began construction in May 2012, added a fifth mixed-flow lane to northbound I-5 between SR-14 and the Gavin Canyon undercrossing, a distance of 1.4 miles. The 3.7 miles of southbound I-5 improvements include a fifth mixed-flow lane between Pico Canyon Road/Lyons Avenue and a half-mile south of Gavin Canyon, and a new segment of truck lane that begins north of Weldon Canyon and merges with the existing truck lane north of the SR-14 connector. New median and outside retaining walls were also built to accommodate the highway widening. The new truck lane segment separates slower moving trucks from passenger vehicles on the steep grade, reducing congestion and enhancing safety in all lanes.

### Response to Comment No. 24-4

#### Intersection Queues at SR-126/Wolcott Way

Queue lengths at the intersection of SR-126 and Wolcott Way were examined to evaluate whether or not adequate storage is available to accommodate peak-hour traffic with the addition of the Proposed Project trips. Table 24-7 reports the available storage for the movements in which the project will add traffic (westbound right-turn and eastbound left-turn movements) at the intersection of SR-126 and Wolcott Way and the anticipated queue lengths in the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing plus Growth (2015) Conditions without Project
- Existing plus Growth (2015) plus Other Development Conditions without Project
- Existing plus Growth (2015) Conditions with Project
- Existing plus Growth (2015) plus Other Development Conditions with Project

The Synchro intersection analysis shows that the projected queue lengths for the westbound right-turn lane and eastbound left-turn lane at SR-126 and Wolcott Way can be accommodated within the provided storage. The provided storage in both the westbound right-turn lane and eastbound left-turn lane pockets at SR-126 and Wolcott Way is 450 feet. The longest projected queue length in the westbound right-turn lane is 21 feet. The longest projected queue length in the eastbound left-turn lane is 52 feet. Both of these projected queue lengths are far less than the 450 feet of provided storage. This allows trucks travelling to CCL from SR-126 adequate space to decelerate inside the turn pockets and not on SR-126.

#### Table 24-7. Queue Analysis At Sr-126/Wolcott Way

|  | Westbound Right-Turn | Eastbound Left-Turn |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|
| Available Off-Ramp Storage Length (ft)                                     | 450                  | 450                 |
| Existing Conditions Queue Length (ft)                                      | 0                    | 34                  |
| Existing plus Growth Queue Length (ft)                                     | 0                    | 34                  |
| Existing plus Growth plus Other Development Queue Length (ft)              | 0                    | 38                  |
| Existing his Growth his Project Queue Length (ft)                          | 21                   | 52                  |
|  |                      | 52                  |
| Existing plus Growth plus Other Development plus Project Queue Length (ft) | 21                   | 52                  |

#### Response to Comment No. 24-5

#### Long-Term Future Analysis of SR-126

The traffic analysis is based on a Proposed Project buildout year of 2015 (i.e., CCL can operate at full capacity in 2015). However, CCL will continue to operate for 20 to 30 years beyond 2015. In the vicinity of the project, the Newhall Land and Farm (NLF) developments will be built in the next 20 to 30 years.

The NLF developments will include improvements to SR-126 in the vicinity of the Proposed Project (between Los Angeles County line and Commerce Center Drive). The NLF improvements on SR-126 include widening of SR-126 and intersection improvements at SR-126 and Wolcott Way. The improvements along SR-126 will be phased as various phases of the NLF developments are built out. Caltrans has requested that the NLF improvements at the intersection of SR-126 and Wolcott Way (project entrance) be studied for the long-term future condition. Therefore, long-term future analysis of the SR-126 and Wolcott Way intersection was done for the year 2045. By the year 2045, Phase 3 of the NLF improvements will be built. Figure 24-2 illustrates the lane geometry of the SR-126/Wolcott Way intersection in 2045.

Long-term future (2045) volumes were provided by Caltrans. The volumes provided by Caltrans represent the 2045 No-Build condition at SR-126 and Wolcott Way. Project traffic volumes were therefore added to the 2045 No-Build condition volumes to assess potential traffic impacts. The 2045 No-Build and Build condition volumes are shown in Figure 24-3.

The intersection of SR-126 and Wolcott Way was reanalyzed with these traffic volumes to determine the project's impact on peak-hour intersection operations in the long-term future (2045). The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 24-8, which also indicates whether or not the Proposed Project has a significant impact at the intersection. Copies of intersection analysis worksheets are provided in Appendix G-3. The analysis shows the Proposed Project will not have a significant impact at the intersection Wey in the long-term future (Year 2045) based on the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program guidelines.



Figure 24-2. 2045 Lane Geometry of the SR-126/Wolcott Way Intersection



Figure 24-3. 2045 No-Build and Build Condition Peak-Hour Volumes at the SR-126/Wolcott Way Intersection

|     |                      | 2045 without Project Conditions<br>AM Peak PN<br>Delay Delay<br>ion Control (sec/veh) LOS ICU LOS (sec/veh) LOS |           |      |       |     |           |      |       | 2045 with Project Conditions |           |     |        |     |             |        |     |       |     |             |
|-----|----------------------|---|-----------|------|-------|-----|-----------|------|-------|------------------------------|-----------|-----|--------|-----|-------------|--------|-----|-------|-----|-------------|
|     |                      |   |           | AM F | Peak  |     |           | PM I | Peak  |                              |           |     | AM Pea | k   |             |        |     | PM P  | eak |             |
|     |                      |   |           |      |       |     |           |      |       |                              |           |     |        |     |             | Delay  |     |       |     |             |
|     |                      |   | Delay     |      |       |     | Delay     |      |       |                              | Delay     |     |        |     | Significant | (sec/v |     |       |     | Significant |
| Int | ersection            | Control   | (sec/veh) | LOS  | ICU   | LOS | (sec/veh) | LOS  | ICU   | LOS                          | (sec/veh) | LOS | ICU    | LOS | Impact?     | eh)    | LOS | ICU   | LOS | Impact?     |
| 3   | Wolcott Way @ SR-126 | Signalized  | 35.5      | D    | 0.701 | В   | 36.9      | D    | 0.744 | С                            | 36.1      | D   | 0.734  | С   | No          | 41.3   | D   | 0.776 | С   | No          |

Table 24-8. Summary of Intersection Analysis – 2045 No-Build and Build Conditions at SR-126/Wolcott Way

While the Proposed Project does not result in a significant traffic impact based on Los Angeles County and Caltrans' traffic impact thresholds, CCL will consult with Caltrans regarding payment of any necessary fees.

### Response to Comment No. 24-6

The following text has been added to Chapter 10, and Figure 7-2 has been revised to clearly show the two storage lanes and the 900 feet distance prior before the scales.

In case of scale malfunction, failure, or emergency, project-related traffic will not be required to queue into Wolcott Way back to SR-126. CCL has backup power for the scales, the ability to put inbound trucks on outbound scales, and the ability to move trucks through the scales and into the landfill without weighing them and the ability to store trucks on the landfill if needed (trash-related [disposal] trucks will need to be stored on the landfill until scales are operational). These methods will ensure Project-related traffic will not be required to queue into Wolcott Way back to SR-126.

### Response to Comment No. 24-7

The Caltrans right-of-way was accounted for in CCL's site entrance design and the proposed entrance improvements will be constructed outside the right-of-way. Caltrans has indicated that any future modifications to SR-126 would likely be conducted within their existing right-of-way.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT 7-OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING 100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012 PHONE (213) 897-8391 FAX (213) 897-1337 www.dot.ca.gov





Serious drought. Help save water!

December 29, 2016

Mr. Richard Claghorn County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 West Temple Street, Room 1348 Los Angeles, CA 90012

> RE: Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Vic. LA-126 / PM R3.562 SCH # 2005081071 Ref. IGR/CEQA No. 140715EA-DEIR GTS # LA-2016-00286AL-DEIR

Dear Mr. Claghorn:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The project is an existing previously permitted landfill requesting continued operation and expansion. The project includes development of a new entrance and support facilities; better utilization of the landfill's potential disposal capacity through a lateral extension of the existing waster footprint and increased maximum elevation; increased daily disposal limits, acceptance of all nonhazardous wastes permitted at a Class III solid waste disposal landfill, exclusive of sludge; continued operation of the landfill; new design features; environmental monitoring; development of a Household Hazardous Waste Facility (HHWF); mixed organics processing/composting operation; and set-aside of land for potential future conversation technology. The Proposed project also includes the relocation of a portion of sub-transmission line in order to accommodate landfill improvements.

There were 2,896 vehicles associated with the baseline and an additional 594 vehicles associated with the Proposed Project. Of the 594 additional vehicles, 572 were assumed to be trucks associated with additional material to be received at the landfill and 22 were associated with additional employees. However, the DEIR did not include a traffic analysis to determine the impacts to State Route 126 (SR-126) and Interstate 5 (I-5).

The Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master plan Revision Traffic Supplement was prepared on November 7, 2016. However, the truck baseline volume used 2011 traffic data. Truck data for 2015 should be used. A passenger car equivalent (PCE) factor of 2.0 or more should be used to convert truck trips to passenger car equivalents.

390-1

390-2

The Proposed Project will remove the existing Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) entrance, which is located on State Route 126 between Chiquita Canyon Road and Wolcott Way, and construct a new entrance on the corner of Wolcott Way and Franklin Parkway. The new entrance is less than 500 feet away from SR-126. Potentially, both eastbound/westbound SR-126 to/from Wolcott Way would be heavily impacted. Potential the extension of the right-turn lane and left-turn pocket should be evaluated and considered.

A cumulative traffic analysis should be conducted and should include the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and development from the Commerce Center area. CCL is seeking to expand the landfill in order to continue operation for 20 to 30 years. The CCL project may potentially have cumulative traffic impacts to SR-126. If the analysis determines that the Project will have cumulative traffic impacts CCL should be prepared to mitigate those impacts by making a fair share contribution towards future improvements to SR-126.

Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful that projects should be designed to discharge clean run-off water. Additionally, discharge of storm water run-off is not permitted onto State highway facilities without any storm water management plan.

Transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials, which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways, will require a transportation permit from Caltrans. It is recommended that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods.

Caltrans expressed traffic concerns, in a letter dated August 25, 2014 (see attached), which should be addressed. Caltrans would like to request a follow up meeting with the Lead Agency to evaluate traffic impacts, identify potential improvements, and establish a funding mechanism that helps mitigate cumulative transportation impacts in the project vicinity.

390-7

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to GTS # LA-2016-00286AL-DEIR.

Sincerely,

DIANNA WATSON, Chief LD-IGR/CEQA Review Branch

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

## Letter No. 390

Department of Transportation District 7 – Office of Transportation Planning Dianna Watson, Chief LD-IGR/CEQA Review Branch 100 S. Main Street, MS 16 Los Angeles, CA 90012

## Response to Comment No. 390-1

Please see responses to Comments 24-2 through 24-5.

### Response to Comment No. 390-2

The baseline traffic volume shown in the Traffic Supplement of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR is that associated with the operational baseline for CCL, as directed by Los Angeles County, and which reflects the traffic associated with the landfill, absent the Proposed Project, on an average day in 2011.

Regardless of the baseline traffic identified for the Proposed Project, the traffic analysis evaluates the potential impacts of the additional vehicles associated with an additional 6,560 tons per day of material to be received at CCL, as described in Final EIR Section 2.2.6.11, Traffic.

Morning and evening peak-hour turning movement traffic counts were conducted at the study intersections in March 2013, and future peak-hour traffic projections for the study intersections were developed for the buildout year of 2015. An annual ambient growth rate of 2.75 percent per year was applied to the existing (2013) traffic volumes. The annual growth rate is based upon direction received from Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Traffic and Lighting Division staff as part of the preparation of the *CCL Master Plan Revision Traffic Analysis* (Appendix G).

#### Response to Comment No. 390-3

Please see responses to Comments 24-4 and 24-5.

#### Response to Comment No. 390-4

Please see response to Comment 24-5.

#### Response to Comment No. 390-5

Stormwater runoff related to the Proposed Project is addressed in Chapter 6, Surface Water Drainage. Onsite stormwater facilities will be managed for the Proposed Project such that discharge onto State highway facilities is not anticipated.

#### Response to Comment No. 390-6

Section 2.2.5.3, Entrance and Support Facilities Construction, states that vehicles associated with construction will be scheduled to avoid peak traffic hours as feasible. This applies to oversized vehicles, as well as to cell construction.

## Response to Comment No. 390-7

Additional detailed analyses have been provided in response to the Caltrans' comment letter received on August 25, 2014. Please see the responses to Comments 24-1 through 24-7.

The Lead Agency will coordinate with Caltrans to review Caltrans' traffic concerns.

## Summary of Comments

- Testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing stated that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Proposed Project did not evaluate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions past the year 2020. It was also stated that there are goals and objectives for GHG emissions reductions past 2020 that the analysis did not address.
- A commenter on the Draft EIR and testifier at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing questioned the landfill gas collection rate used for the Proposed Project.

## Applicant Rebuttal – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Evaluation Past 2020

- The project complies with all regulations promulgated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) that are intended to insure that the waste management sector does its fair share to allow the state to meet the GHG emission reduction targets of Assembly Bill (AB) 32.
- The Final EIR,<sup>1</sup> estimates GHG emissions from the project through the year 2050 (Tables 12-3 through 12-7). Emissions presented are through 2050, because that is the longest horizon used in any of the state documents that set forth goals for reduction of GHGs. As shown, Proposed Project impacts are relatively small in 2020, peak in 2037, and decline in subsequent years, based on a set of assumptions that includes a 10-year ramp up to 60,000 tons per week and the landfill reaching capacity in 2039.

The Final EIR determined that GHG impacts of the Proposed Project up to and including the year 2020 are less than significant because the landfill would be constructed and operated in accordance with state plans for the waste management sector and the County's Climate Action Plan, and the proposed design would reduce GHG emissions as compared to CARB's business-as-usual (BAU) assumptions specific to the waste management sector.

While targets have been established for further GHG emission reductions beyond 2020, CARB has not estimated BAU emissions beyond 2020 or defined strategies to achieve the new 2030 and 2050 emission reduction goals. Therefore, it is impossible at this time to specify whether the impacts of the Proposed Project will be consistent with future state and regional plans for GHG management beyond the 2020 horizon. Because of this, the EIR conservatively determined that potential emissions, beyond 2020, would be potentially significant and unavoidable.

## Applicant Rebuttal – Landfill Gas Collection Rate

• Landfill gas collection efficiency at CCL has been appropriately calculated and accounted for in the Proposed Project.

CCL consulted with the County and with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) in preparation of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, including discussion of the landfill gas collection efficiency data. In response to this consultation, Golder Associates updated its report, verifying calculations and assumptions for the collection efficiency figure used for the updated analysis. This report is provided in Appendix H-4 of the Final EIR. The report from Golder Associates documents an alternate method for calculating landfill gas collection efficiency requested by SCAQMD, which results in 81.7 percent efficiency.

As described on page 12-18 of Chapter 12 of the Final EIR, the landfill proposes a Best Management Practice (described in Chapter 11 of the Final EIR) to increase landfill gas collection efficiency through

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita* Canyon *Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL APPLICANT REBUTTAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

management of daily, intermediate, and final cover, including converting areas of intermediate cover to equivalent final cover. This Best Management Practice would increase the collection efficiency to 85 percent. Thus, 85 percent efficiency is assumed for the remainder of the landfill life.

## Summary of Comments

• Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission have stated that Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) has resulted in reduced property values surrounding the landfill.

### Applicant Rebuttal

• The Final EIR<sup>1</sup> found that CCL has not resulted in reduced property values in the vicinity of the landfill.

The subject of property values was addressed in Topical Response #20, Property Values, of the Final EIR. This topical response states, in part, that:

Landfill operations at CCL have been permitted by Los Angeles County since 1965, and housing and business have continued to be built near the landfill. Between the prior CCL expansion EIR (1995-1997) and present, the Commerce Center east of the landfill has been developed, and numerous commercial, industrial, and residential developments have been proposed surrounding CCL, as described in EIR Section 3.2.9, Cumulative Impacts, and shown in Figure 3-1, Cumulative Projects. Numerous local businesses and Chambers of Commerce have provided letters of support for the Proposed Project. There is no evidence to support the argument that businesses would relocate out of the area if the Proposed Project were approved or that Los Angeles County would experience a reduction in tax income from the loss of business or residential developments.

Related to the issue of property values for individual residential properties, CCL had a housing price impact study (Study) conducted by real estate advisory firm RCLCO to evaluate residential pricing trends in Val Verde and similar surrounding areas. The Study found that there is "no basis to conclude that the Landfill has impacted surrounding area home price appreciation." Rather, except for the years 2005-2009 (a time of market recession), home prices in Val Verde outpaced the Los Angeles Metropolitan Statistical Area every year between 1998 and 2014.

### Attachments

- Final EIR Topical Response #20, Property Values
- RCLCO Housing Price Impact Study

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

## 20. Property Values

#### Summary of Comments

Comments were received from the general public suggesting that the Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) expansion will result in a significant loss in property values for the residences and businesses located in Val Verde, Castaic, and Hasley Hills. It was stated that the Los Angeles County Assessor should report on the property value effects on all properties within 1.8 miles from the landfill and that the report should contain projected values if the extension is approved along with the values if the landfill is closed as commenters purport is presently required by contract (Topical Response #5, Conditional Use Permit and Community Agreement, for additional information). Commenters stated that short term profits from the landfill operations must be weighed against the loss of continued property tax incomes from high end businesses and residential locations in the landfill area. Commenter also suggested that businesses would relocate out of the area if the expansion were approved. One commenter asked how residents will be compensated for the loss in value of their home.

#### Response

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to document the potential environmental impacts of a project being considered. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not require an economic analysis of tax benefits or losses as a result of a proposed project. Under CEQA, "[a]n economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15382). CEQA does not require an analysis of social and economic impacts, only physical impacts to the environment as a result of a project.

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors found in 1997 that the landfill is consistent and compatible with surrounding land uses. Additionally, the Proposed Project is consistent with current underlying plan designations, is consistent with currently underlying zoning designations, and would not conflict with applicable land use criteria.

Landfill operations at CCL have been permitted by Los Angeles County since 1965, and housing and business have continued to be built near the landfill. Between the prior CCL expansion EIR (1995-1997) and present, the Commerce Center east of the landfill has been developed, and numerous commercial, industrial, and residential developments have been proposed surrounding CCL, as described in the Original Draft EIR Section 3.2.9, Cumulative Impacts, and shown in Figure 3-1, Cumulative Projects. Numerous local businesses and Chambers of Commerce have provided letters of support for the Proposed Project. There is no evidence to support the comments stating that businesses would relocate out of the area if the Proposed Project were approved or that Los Angeles County would experience a reduction in tax income from the loss of business or residential developments.

Notwithstanding the above, a CCL Housing Price Impact Study (Study) was conducted for the Proposed Project by real estate advisory firm RCLCO to evaluate residential pricing trends in Val Verde and similar surrounding areas of CCL as compared to the Los Angeles Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)<sup>1</sup>.

The Study compared the annual rates of change in the average price per square foot for single-family properties in the 91384 zip code located within per miles of CCL to the Los Angeles MSA. The Study examines two time periods: 1997 to 1999 and 2005 to 2014.

The Study concludes that CCL "has not impacted the rate of change in home prices in the Subject Areas, and that there is no clear relationship between the Landfill and changes in home prices in its surrounding residential areas." The Study found that from 1997 to 1999, home prices in Val Verde outpaced the Los Angeles MSA by 21.4 to 29.6 percent, and from 2010 to 2014, home prices in Val Verde outpaced the Los Angeles MSA by 4.4 to 17.8 percent. Only from 2005 to 2009 did home prices in Val Verde decline at a faster rate than the broader Los Angeles MSA, by 14.4 to 30.4 percent. Based on this data, there is "no basis to conclude that the Landfill has impacted surrounding area home price appreciation."

The RCLCO Study is attached to the Final EIR as Appendix L.

Topical Response #5, CUP and Community Agreement, contains additional information about the current CUP for CCL and the agreement between CCL and the Val Verde community.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Los Angeles Metropolitan Statistical Area is defined as Los Angeles and Orange counties.



## Memorandum

DATE: February 2, 2017

TO: Brenda Eells

COMPANY: CH2M Hill

FROM: Taylor Mammen and Ben Maslan

SUBJECT: Chiquita Canyon Landfill Housing Price Impact Study

RCLCO was retained to evaluate residential pricing trends in Val Verde, a census-designated place in Los Angeles County, and similar surrounding areas of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill ("Landfill") as compared to Los Angeles. In particular, RCLCO was retained to determine if the Landfill impacted the rate of housing price appreciation in Val Verde and the surrounding residential areas to the Landfill relative to the broader Los Angeles MSA.

We conclude that there is no evidence that the Landfill had any impact on the change in housing prices in Val Verde or areas of similar geographic proximity to the Landfill.

#### Methodology

We have calculated the annual rate of change in housing prices based on the average price per square foot for each home sold in Val Verde and other housing units in the 91384 zip code located within five miles of the Landfill (the "Subject Areas").<sup>1</sup> Sales records used in the analysis include only single-family, detached residential units located in the Subject Areas during the time periods specified below.<sup>2</sup>

The annual rates of change in the average price per square foot for the Subject Areas were then compared to the annual changes in the Federal Housing Finance Administration Home Price Index ("FHFA HPI") and S&P/Case-Shiller Home Price Index ("Case Shiller HPI") for the Los Angeles MSA. The FHFA HPI uses the repeat-sales method, which compares sale prices of the same single-family, detached properties over time. The FHFA HPI is calculated based on mortgages that have been purchased or securitized by Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac, and thus includes both refinances as well as sales.<sup>3</sup> The Case-Shiller HPI also uses the repeat-sales method; however, does not include mortgage refinances.<sup>4</sup>

Both indices only include transactions on single-family properties; thus, we have limited our analysis to detached single-family properties and excluded transaction on condominiums, townhomes, cooperatives, multi-unit properties, and planned unit developments. In addition, because the FHFA HPI is based only on transactions involving conforming, conventional mortgages purchased or securitized by Fannie Mae or

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Five miles is the approximate maximum distance from the Landfill to homes located within Val Verde.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Sales records were pulled from Real Quest, which obtains its data from the county assessor. Records that appeared to be incomplete or inaccurate (e.g., the order of magnitude in prices appeared unrealistic) were omitted to ensure data integrity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Federal Housing Finance Agency Housing Price Index Frequently Asked Questions, August, 26, 2014.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> S&P/Case-Shiller Home Price Indices Methodology, February 2015.

Freddie Mac,<sup>5</sup> we have included only homes that would qualify for a conforming mortgage assuming an 80% loan-to-value ("LTV") ratio when comparing Subject Area price changes to the LA FHFA HPI.<sup>6</sup>

We examined changes in house prices over two time periods: from 1997 to 1999, the three years immediately subsequent to the last expansion of the Landfill; and the most recent ten years (2005 to 2014).

#### Results

Our analysis indicates that the Landfill has not impacted the rate of change in home prices in the Subject Areas, and that there is no clear relationship between the Landfill and changes in home prices in its surrounding residential areas. Indeed, depending on the time period selected, home prices in the Subject Areas either increased at a faster rate or lagged home price changes in the Los Angeles MSA, as shown in the accompanying Exhibits.

From 1997 to 1999, the three-year period immediately subsequent to the last expansion of the Landfill, home prices in the Subject Areas increased at a faster rate than home prices in Los Angeles County. In fact, home prices in Val Verde outpaced the LA FHFA HPI by 29.6% and the LA Case-Shiller HPI by 21.4% over this three-year period. While sales volumes were low in Val Verde (primarily due to its small size), sales volumes were much larger within five miles of the Landfill in 91384 with similar results. Specifically, home prices within five miles of the Landfill in 91384 outpaced the LA FHFA HPI by 16.1% and the LA Case-Shiller HPI by 7.1% over the three-year period. Similarly, from 2010 to 2014, home prices in Val Verde outpaced the LA FHFA HPI by 17.8% and the LA Case-Shiller HPI by 4.4%.<sup>7</sup> Over the same time period, home prices within five miles of the Landfill in 91384 displayed mixed results, and outpaced the LA FHFA HPI by 8.7% while declining relative to the LA Case-Shiller HPI by -4.7%.

From 2005 to 2009, however, home prices in Val Verde declined at a faster rate than the broader Los Angeles MSA as measured by the LA FHFA HPI by -30.4% and the LA Case-Shiller HPI by -14.4%. Home prices within five miles of the Landfill in 91384 declined by an incremental -19.2% over the FHFA HPI and by -0.3% over the Case-Shiller HPI.

#### Conclusion

Based on the high variance and inconsistency in the rate of change between home prices in the Subject Areas and the Los Angeles home price indices, there is no basis to conclude that the Landfill has impacted surrounding area home price appreciation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> We note that sales volume declined in Val Verde in 2014 relative to prior years. A substantial portion of this decline cannot be attributable to a decline in housing demand as a result of the public release of the environmental impact report ("EIR") in August 2014, as the decline in sales volume occurred prior to the EIR was released. For example, the average monthly year-over-year decline in sales volumes for Q1 2014 (January 2014 to March 2014) was 88.9%, substantially greater than the average monthly year-over-year decline for Q4 2014 (October 2014 to December 2014) of 50.0%. Moreover, a decline in demand would have resulted in a decline in price, as sellers would have had to lower asking prices in response to the downward shift in demand. This, however, is not the case, as prices in Val Verde actually increased by 34.7% in 2014 year-over-year, compared to 12.1% for the LA FHFA HPI and 5.5% for the LA Case-Shiller HPI.



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> A conforming mortgage is equal to or less than the dollar amount established by the conforming loan limit set by the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight and meets the funding criteria of Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. Los Angeles County is considered a "high-cost area," and thus has a conforming loan limit of \$625,000 as of 2015, higher than the national norm of \$417,000. Conventional mortgages are those that are neither insured nor guaranteed by a federal government entity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> An 80% LTV (i.e., a 20% down payment), has historically been the maximum LTV required by conventional lenders and the GSEs to fund a loan.

## **General Limiting Conditions**

Reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that the data contained in this study reflect accurate and timely information and are believed to be reliable. This study is based on estimates, assumptions, and other information developed by RCLCO from its independent research effort, general knowledge of the industry, and consultations with the client and its representatives. No responsibility is assumed for inaccuracies in reporting by the client, its agent, and representatives or in any other data source used in preparing or presenting this study. This report is based on information that to our knowledge was current as of the date of this report, and RCLCO has not undertaken any update of its research effort since such date.

Our report may contain prospective financial information, estimates, or opinions that represent our view of reasonable expectations at a particular time, but such information, estimates, or opinions are not offered as predictions or assurances that a particular level of income or profit will be achieved, that particular events will occur, or that a particular price will be offered or accepted. Actual results achieved during the period covered by our prospective financial analysis may vary from those described in our report, and the variations may be material. Therefore, no warranty or representation is made by RCLCO that any of the projected values or results contained in this study will be achieved.

Possession of this study does not carry with it the right of publication thereof or to use the name of "Robert Charles Lesser & Co." or "RCLCO" in any manner without first obtaining the prior written consent of RCLCO. No abstracting, excerpting, or summarization of this study may be made without first obtaining the prior written consent of RCLCO. This report is not to be used in conjunction with any public or private offering of securities or other similar purpose where it may be relied upon to any degree by any person other than the client without first obtaining the prior written consent of RCLCO. This study may not be used for any purpose other than that for which it is prepared or for which prior written consent has first been obtained from RCLCO.



## Summary of Comments

• Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing have claimed that the Proposed Project results in environmental justice impacts to the community of Val Verde.

### Applicant Rebuttal

- The community of Val Verde is not a disadvantaged population and would not result in disproportionate impacts of the Proposed Project.
- The Draft EIR evaluated environmental justice and socioeconomics in Chapter 16.
- The Final EIR<sup>1</sup> addressed environmental justice in Topical Response #9, Environmental Justice.
- The population of Val Verde is 78.7 percent minority and the population of Los Angeles County is 73.1 percent minority; this difference is not meaningful because the concentrations of the minority populations are similar (a 5.6 percent difference).
- The proportion of low-income persons in Los Angeles County is greater than Val Verde (18.2 percent and 16.8 percent, respectively).
- The Proposed Project would not disproportionately impact a minority or low-income population, and the Proposed Project would not result in environmental justice impacts.

#### Attachments

• Final EIR Topical Response #9, Environmental Justice

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

## 9. Environmental Justice

#### **Summary of Comments**

Many comments were received on the subject of Environmental Justice, including comments regarding the methodology used and the significance determination The comments are summarized below.

## 9a Methodology

### **Comment Summary**

Comments were made suggesting that the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) did not accurately evaluate the potential Environmental Justice impacts to the community of Val Verde. Commenters stated that the data to determine if Val Verde has a disproportionate population of minorities and lowincome residents should be compared to its region and that regionally, Val Verde is part of Santa Clarita and Castaic. It was suggested that comparing the vast region of Los Angeles to Val Verde to determine if Val Verde is an affected population does not determine the socioeconomic characteristics of Val Verde in relation to its surrounding areas. It was stated that using County of Los Angeles statistics for affected areas based on the point that the entire County would benefit from the Project approval is flawed and illogical. It was suggested that the guidelines to determine "affected populations" do not include potential benefits to a wide region. It was recommended that if a larger general area is desired, much of Ventura County should be considered. It was also stated that level of education is an important determining factor for income, poverty, health and well-being and is closely correlated in the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS) data. It was stated that an evaluation of education was missing from the Draft EIR. It was stated that the County should make a good-faith effort to temporarily and immediately suspend the EIR process until the Draft EIR can be amended to reflect accurate information.

One commenter provided numerous recommendations on how the commenter believed the analysis should be revised to accurately evaluate the environmental justice impacts to Val Verde. The recommendations generally included updating health and environmental data specific to the community of Val Verde, using an Environmental Justice expert to perform the analysis, notifying all agencies whose scope includes provisions and/or enforcement of the Proposed Project that their own Environmental Justice regulations need to be applied to the Proposed Project and requesting input from the agencies on how to accurately collect and compile data.

### Response - General Methodology for Environmental Justice

Broadly speaking, an evaluation of Environmental Justice is undertaken to ensure that the potential environmental impacts of a project do not disproportionally affect a disadvantaged community. The methodology for assessing Environmental Justice is generally described below:

First, the minority and income status of the community in which a project is located is compared to the minority and income status of the population within a larger geographic unit in which the project is located.

Environmental Justice analyses typically rely on the most recent U.S. Census data that provides information at the smallest geographic unit available. Typically, the Census Block is the smallest

geographic unit, but because census block group data only includes minority data and is only updated once a decade, other data may be used, for example, ACS 5-year Estimates. The ACS 5-year Estimates provides data at the Census Block Group level and provides data for both minority and low-income populations. Low-income populations are considered to be populations living below the poverty line.

Level of education is not typically applied to a determination of disadvantaged population. However, an evaluation may include the use of limited English proficiency to help define minority populations and languages that would be needed to translate materials as appropriate.

The minority and income status of the population within the geographic unit in which the project is located is compared to the minority and income status of the population within the larger geographic unit in which the project is located. The comparison looks at whether the population in the smaller geographic unit closest to the project, and therefore potentially more likely to be impacted by the project, has a significantly greater minority population or a significantly lower income than the population of the larger geographic unit.

If either of these conditions are present, the population in the smaller geographic unit is potentially a disadvantaged population, and a more detailed evaluation of the potential for Environmental Justice impacts should be undertaken. Specifically, the project evaluation would then look in detail at the potential impacts of a proposed project and determine if the impacts of the project would disproportionately affect the disadvantaged population. If the impacts would disproportionally affect a disadvantaged population, then there is likely an Environmental Justice issue.

If neither of these conditions are present, then it is unlikely that the community within the smaller geographic unit closest to the Proposed Project is a disadvantaged population and it is further unlikely that there is a potential for an Environmental Justice issue. This is not to say that the community within the smaller geographic unit closest to the project is free from potential impacts, only that those potential impacts would not result in an Environmental Justice impact.

## Response – Methodology Used for Chiquita Canyon Landfill

The Original Draft EIR for the Proposed Project used the methodology described above. The demographic characteristics of the population for Val Verde (the census block within which the Proposed Project is located) were compared to the demographic characteristics of the population of Los Angeles County (the larger geographic unit within which the Proposed Project is located). CCL is a regional landfill located entirely within unincorporated Los Angeles County. Although the landfill is located near Ventura County, it primarily serves communities and cities of Los Angeles County. Therefore because the landfill is located entirely within Los Angeles County, and because the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning is the Lead Agency, it is appropriate to compare the demographic characteristics of the population of Val Verde with the demographic characteristics of the population of Val Verde with the demographic characteristics of the population of Val Verde with the demographic characteristics of the population of Val Verde with the demographic characteristics of the population of Val Verde with the demographic characteristics of the population of Los Angeles County.

## 9b Significance Determination

### **Comment Summary**

Commenters stated that the Proposed Project will disproportionately affect a predominantly Hispanic and low income population in Val Verde. It was stated that the Draft EIR considers the issue of Environmental Justice to be non-applicable to the Proposed Project and that this finding is inaccurate and unacceptable. It was stated that the Hispanic population will suffer financial and quality of life losses, and health issues. It was also stated that the residents of Val Verde express an experience of being unjustly treated by the County and treated as a sacrifice zone to receive wastes from the rest of the region. It was stated that the impacts on the residents are not only physical/environmental, but also include serious experiences of dread, emotional fatigue, and social stigma. Commenters stated that Val Verde is conscripted to receive waste that it did not generate and suffer effects the rest of the County residents do not, while also having a lack of benefits (such as receipt of a share of tipping fees, job allocation/quota for local residents, infrastructure/urban amenities, health services and insurance, etc.) that might partially ameliorate for the negative impacts of the landfill. Finally, it was stated that placing potentially the nation's largest landfill next to one of the nation's poorest communities is a blatant violation of *the California Environmental Quality Act* and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

#### Response

The evaluation of minority population in Val Verde and Los Angeles County in the Original Draft EIR found that the minority population of Los Angeles County was 72.2 percent of the total population, while the minority population of Val Verde was 70.1 percent of the total population. The evaluation of median household income in the Original Draft EIR found that the median family income for the time period 2006 to 2010 in Los Angeles County was \$55,476. During the same time period, the median family income in Val Verde was \$56,934. Also, the Original Draft EIR found that the number of individuals below the poverty line in Los Angeles County was 15.7 percent of the total, while the number of individuals below the poverty line in Val Verde was 9.1 percent of the total.

Based on the methodology described above, the Original Draft EIR correctly determined that the community of Val Verde is not a disadvantaged population, as measured by minority or low-income characteristics compared to Los Angeles County. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not disproportionately impact a minority or low-income population, and the Proposed Project would not result in Environmental Justice impacts.

The demographic characteristics of Val Verde and Los Angeles County were reviewed for updates that may change this determination. The latest available ACS 5-year estimates were reviewed, and it was found that Val Verde has a mean annual resident income above the County average. The minority population in both Val Verde and Los Angeles County has increased, with Val Verde now at 78.7 percent of the total population and Los Angeles County at 73.1 percent of the total population. However, this difference is not meaningful, because the concentrations of the minority populations is similar (a 5.6 percent difference). The proportion of low-income persons (i.e. persons living below the poverty line) in Los Angeles County is greater than Val Verde (18.2 percent and 16.8 percent, respectively). Table 1 presents this updated demographic characteristics data based on the 2011-2015 ACS 5-year Estimates.

| Table I Belliographie enalacterist               | 65        |         |                    |         |
|--|-----------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| Demographic                                      | Val Verde | Percent | Los Angeles County | Percent |
| Total Population                                 | 2,697     |         | 10,038,388         |         |
| Minority   | 2,122     | 78.7    | 7,334,841          | 73.1    |
| Hispanic or Latino                               | 1,794     | 66.5    | 4,842,319          | 48.2    |
| Population for whom poverty status is determined | 2,697     |         | 9,886,133          |         |
| Low-Income Population                            | 454       | 16.8    | 1,800,265          | 18.2    |
|  |           |         |                    |         |
| Median Household Income                          | \$72,031  |         | \$56,196           |         |
|  |           |         |                    |         |
| Population 5 years and Over                      | 2,502     |         | 9,396,753          |         |
| Limited English Proficiency                      | 586       | 23.4    | 2,379,799          | 25.3    |

#### **Table 1 Demographic Characteristics**

The updated review of demographic characteristics (described above and presented in Table 1) in Val Verde and Los Angeles County does not change the findings of the Original Draft EIR. The Proposed Project would not disproportionately impact a minority or low-income population, and the Proposed Project would not result in Environmental Justice impacts.

The existing physical infrastructure in Val Verde, availability of health services and insurance, and other "benefits" raised by the commenters are unrelated to the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project does not result in any impacts to community resources including resources that serve an especially important social, religious, or cultural function for a minority and/or a low-income population.

It is incorrect that CCL would be potentially the nation's largest landfill. Even with the Proposed Project at 12,000 tons per day of disposal, CCL would be smaller than two other landfills in Southern California, based on the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery Solid Waste Information Management System (SWIMS). SWIMS shows the daily permitted capacity at Sunshine Canyon Landfill in Los Angeles County and El Sobrante Landfill in Riverside County is 12,100 tons per day and 16,054 tons per day, respectively. It should further be noted that landfills in California are restricted by daily tonnage limits, while landfills in most other parts of the country are not. Therefore, it is impossible to compare the Proposed Project, which requested or 12,000 tons per day to landfills without a daily tonnage limit.

Neither the Project nor the current EIR review process is in violation of *the California Environmental Quality Act* or the Civil Rights Act.

## 9c Other Comments

#### **Comment Summary**

Other specific comments related to Environmental Justice include comments that the version of the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's (OEHHA) Cal/Enviroscreen 1.1 listed is not the current version of the program, that the EIR be reviewed by the California EPA and the State Attorney General before the approval process moves forward in the county as an Environmental Justice issue, and that the LA County Water District 36, Newhall Water District, Castaic School District, Hart School District, Chumash Tribal Council, Fernandeno Tataviam Tribal Council, California State Attorney General, Los Angeles County Assessor's Office, Castaic Chamber of Commerce, California Air Resources Board, and South Coast Air Quality Management District be added to the list of reviewing agencies.

#### Response

The Castaic School District, Hart School District, Fernandeno Tataviam Tribal Council, California Air Resources Board, and South Coast Air Quality Management District have been notified and/or have commented on the Proposed Project. The other agencies listed are not located within 1,000 feet of the Proposed Project site or do not have jurisdiction over the Proposed Project. It is not the Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning's protocol to send a Draft EIR of this nature to the State Attorney General or the Los Angeles County Assessor's office.

In response to the comment questioning the OEHHA model, OEHHA's Cal/Enviroscreen 1.1 was the current version of the program at the time the Draft EIR was released for public review. CalEnviroscreen 3.0 is the current version of the OEHHA model referenced. This model is discussed in Topical Response #21, Public Health.

## Summary of Comments

- Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing have stated that the Proposed Project is required to comply with the One Valley One Vision Plan, with regard to ridgeline protection.
- A commenter on the Draft EIR and testifier at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing has stated that state legislation, regarding diversion of waste from landfills, reduces or eliminates the need for the Proposed Project.

## Applicant Rebuttal – Land Use Consistency

• Final EIR<sup>1</sup> Topical Response #27, Visual Resources, addresses the consistency of the Proposed Project with the One Valley One Vision General Plan. Topical Response #27 states:

The One Valley One Vision General Plan, June 2011, describes City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles standards to preserve hillside areas and significant ridgelines. The Proposed Project is not located within the City of Santa Clarita and therefore, the discussion of hillside areas and significant ridgelines within the city is not applicable to the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is located within the County of Los Angeles. Los Angeles County standards to preserve hillside areas and significant ridgelines relevant to the Proposed Project are found in the CACSD [Castaic Area Community Standards District] and the relevant policies of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan... the Proposed Project conforms to the CACSD regarding ridgeline protection.

## Applicant Rebuttal – Waste Reduction Legislation

- Final EIR Topical Response #19, Project Need, addresses recently-approved legislation aimed at maximizing the amount of waste diverted from landfills.
- The Proposed Project assessment of need relies on the Los Angeles County Department of Public Work's assessment of waste disposal capacity for Los Angeles County, rather than an assessment of individual pieces of legislation, to determine the need for the Proposed Project.
- The 2015 Annual Report to the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) addresses Assembly Bill (AB) 939, AB 341, Senate Bill (SB) 1016, AB 32, AB 1594, AB 1826, and SB 498. The overall goals of these bills are aimed at maximizing the amount of waste diverted from landfills.
- The 2015 Annual Report to the CIWMP finds that in-County landfills (including Chiquita Canyon Landfill) should be expanded, if found to be environmentally sound and technically feasible, and that expansion of existing in-County landfills is an important part of Los Angeles County's overall waste management strategy for the next 15 years.

#### Attachments

- Final EIR Topical Response #27, Visual Resources
- Final EIR Topical Response #19, Project Need

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

# **CCL** Topical Responses

## 27. Visual Resources

Comments regarding visual resources include concerns about impacts to State Route (SR) 126, conflicts with local community plans, inadequate and inaccurate visual simulations, impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods, and cumulative impacts. A summary of the comments by topic and the responses is provided below.

#### 27a. SR-126

#### **Summary of Comments**

Commenters indicated that SR-126 is a first Priority Scenic Highway and that the proposed landfill height and visibility would make this roadway forfeit the scenic designation resulting in a potentially significant impact.

#### Response

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP) considered scenic routes and roadways in the analysis presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Proposed Project. Approximately 35 miles of SR-126 (from SR-150 to Interstate [I] 5) is a <u>proposed</u> first Priority Scenic Highway. This portion of SR-126 became eligible as a scenic highway in 1963. As such, the roadway currently has no formal scenic highway designation. The Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan identifies the section of SR-126 south of CCL, between I-5 and Ventura County as a First Priority scenic route, proposed for further study. Nothing in the General Plan Scenic Highway Element restricts development along First Priority scenic routes. The Scenic Highways Plan of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan reiterates the designation of the portion of SR-126 south of Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) as a First Priority scenic route. This designation does not preclude development. Official designation of a scenic route by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) also does not preclude development along the route.

CCL is one of many features along the overall length of the proposed scenic highway, which also includes the urban setting of Fillmore, a large subdivision located immediately east of Fillmore along the south side of SR-126, the commercial and industrial uses within the Valencia Commerce Center, and the proposed full diamond interchange at Commerce Center Drive and SR-126, all of which are/or will be visible from SR-126.

Based on the findings of the Original Draft EIR, Chapter 15, Visual Resources, as well as the Visual Supplement included in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would not represent a significant decrease in visual character and/or scenic quality. Thus the Proposed Project would not interfere with or prevent the consideration of SR-126 as a scenic route compared to existing conditions. As part of the Proposed Project entrance, a berm and screening wall would be constructed so that entrance facilities would be screened from view from SR-126. A combination of berm and/or wall would extend along the west side of Wolcott Way, along the entire Proposed Project entrance as it parallels SR-126, and across the existing landfill entrance. The berm and area between the berm and roadways (outside of Caltrans rights of way) would be landscaped with native grasses, shrubs, and trees. After the closure of CCL, the presence of the new fill area would create a negligible change in the landscape and these changes would not represent a significant decrease in visual character and/or scenic quality

compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not render the roadway ineligible for the proposed designation as a Scenic Highway.

#### 27b. Community Plans

#### **Summary of Comments**

It was stated that the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CACSD) and the Santa Clarita Valley Significant Ecological Area (SEA) vista regulations are not listed as regulations in the Draft EIR. Commenters noted that CCL is located in the CACSD (22.44.137) in Los Angeles County, and is not listed as exempt from section D.6, "Significant Ridgeline Protection". It was stated that the proposed increase in height would violate the CACSD. Commenters stated that the proposed height would also be visible throughout the valley including Stevenson Ranch, I-5 and the City of Santa Clarita. It was stated that this is a violation of the One Valley One Vision Ordinance. Commenters asked about what mitigations will be made to the extended Santa Clarita Valley.

#### Response

The Original Draft EIR Chapter 4, Land Use, and Chapter 15, Visual Resources, Section 15.3.3, addresses the CACSD, as does the Visual Supplement included in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR. The Proposed Project is located within the CACSD and conforms to the CACSD requirements for ridgeline protection. Specifically, the CACSD states that "no development, grading, construction, or improvements shall be allowed on:

- i. a significant ridgeline
- ii. within a 50-foot radius from every point on the crest of a primary ridgeline
- iii. within a 25-foot radius from every point on the crest of a secondary ridgeline"

Grading for the Proposed Project complies with all of these conditions. The Proposed Project does not include grading on a protected ridgeline or within a 50-foot radius of a protected ridgeline. The Final Grading Plan for the Proposed Project as shown in Figure 2-3 of the Original Draft EIR, Chapter 2, Project Description and Figure 2-3 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR, Chapter 2, Project Description was designed to be consistent with the CACSD requirements to ensure that the Proposed Project does not violate any of these provisions. To demonstrate the Proposed Project compliance with the CACSD requirements for ridgeline protection, Figures 1 and 2 of this Topical Response were created to show the primary and secondary ridgelines surrounding CCL and the extent of grading for the Proposed Project.

CCL is not located within an SEA and therefore regulations associated with SEAs do not apply to the Proposed Project.

The One Valley One Vision General Plan, June 2011, describes City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles standards to preserve hillside areas and significant ridgelines. The Proposed Project is not located within the City of Santa Clarita and therefore, the discussion of hillside areas and significant ridgelines within the city is not applicable to the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is located within the County of Los Angeles. Los Angeles County standards to preserve hillside areas and significant ridgelines relevant to the Proposed Project are found in the CACSD and the relevant policies of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. As described above, the Proposed Project conforms to the CACSD regarding ridgeline protection.

#### 27c. Neighborhood Impacts and Visual Simulations

#### **Summary of Comments**

Comments were received regarding visual impacts to the surrounding communities and regarding the adequacy and accuracy of the visual simulations to depict these potential impacts. Commenters requested that all height projections be shown using photos from all visually affected roadways, community ingress/egress pathways, and from the neighborhoods of Live Oak, Valencia Industrial Park, Mission Village, North River, and Val Verde. Commenters also indicated that other scenic jurisdictions along the SR-126 corridor must be considered. It was stated that within the areas of Hasley Hills and Live Oak, the CACSD violation will be considerable during the landfill operation and after closure. It was claimed that the unnatural and unsightly landform will destroy the view of the Santa Susana and San Gabriel Mountains in both Castaic and Santa Clarita.

One comment was made that the Draft EIR does not have a section regarding visual impacts on Del Valle Road and that it does not include a view from Newhall Ranch Road east of I-5 where the landfill is already visible. It was stated that the visual simulations in the EIR show only views of the landfill after it has been closed and do not include simulations prior to landfill closure, which would show trash trucks. It was stated that the simulations do not accurately depict the infrastructure needed for a closed landfill, including the 20-foot wide benches that would be required in the final landfill cap. It was suggested that the simulations do not correctly depict the view from the intersection of Commerce Center Drive and SR-126, including the proposed overpass. It was stated that the "after-simulations" show a repaired sign for the Travel Village. An explanation was requested as to why this was repaired, if CCL will be repairing it, the rust removal procedure for the sign and what type of paint will be used prevent future rust. Commenters also stated that the height, shape and dimensions of the simulated buildings should be verified.

#### Response

Original Draft EIR Chapter 15, Visual Resources, concludes that the Proposed Project will result in no significant impacts to the surrounding communities. The Proposed Project will not be in violation of the CACSD. The primary visual impact associated with the Proposed Project is the change in landform, as discussed in detail in the Original Draft EIR, Chapter 15, Visual Resources. The visual simulations prepared for the Proposed Project correctly reflect the anticipated landform change.

There are no known formally designated scenic vistas with views of the Proposed Project. In lieu of formal scenic vistas, and because photos of the Proposed Project cannot be shown from all viewable locations, representative locations where the Project would likely be seen by members of the general public (referred to as Key Observation Points [KOPs]) were identified to show existing and future views of CCL. The baseline photos used for visual simulations in the Original Draft EIR, Chapter 15, Visual Resources, are of existing conditions approximately at the time the Notice of Preparation was released for the Proposed Project (November 2011).

The Visual Supplement included in the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR updated the existing condition photos for the visual simulations conducted from KOPs where the existing condition changed subsequent to the Original Draft EIR (KOP 1, KOP 2, and KOP 3). The Visual Supplement also added two KOPs (KOP 8 and KOP 9) to document additional views of the Proposed Project.

During operation of the project, the presence of trucks at the landfill, if visible, would not be expected to affect the viewer given distance and viewing angle to activities. The approximate distance between the viewer (KOP) and slopes on which activities would be occurring are shown below:

KOP 1 – 1.2 to 1.5 miles
KOP 2 – 1.1 to 1.4 miles KOP 3 – 0.9 to 1.2 miles KOP 5 – 0.6 to 0.9 miles KOP 6 – 0.6 to 0.9 miles KOP 7 – 0.6 to 0.8 miles KOP 8 – 0.4 to 0.8 miles KOP 9 – 1.6 to 2.0 miles

Other KOPs discussed in the EIR would not have a view of ongoing operations.

With respect to the intersection of Commerce Center Drive and SR-126, at the time the Original Draft EIR was released for public review in July 2014, the overpass was not yet constructed and it was not feasible to provide a view of the Proposed Project from that location. Between the Original Draft EIR and August 2016, the existing condition at, and view from, KOP 2 (the intersection of Commerce Center Drive and SR-126) changed significantly. Specifically, the intersection of SR-126 and Commerce Center Drive has been replaced by a fly-over intersection in approximately the same location, and on- and off-ramps to SR-126 from/to Commerce Center Drive were under construction. Drivers no longer have an extended view toward CCL from this 4-way intersection. Instead, drivers now have an elevated, but oblique, high-speed view as vehicles pass through the vicinity of SR-126 and Commerce Center Drive. The updated existing condition view of CCL from KOP 2 is shown in Figure VS-3 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Visual Supplement, and simulated views of the Proposed Project from KOP 2 are shown in Figures VS-4 and VS-5.

The visual simulations of the landfill at the time of the Proposed Project closure are an accurate representation of the future condition. The simulations include facilities present at the landfill, although these facilities may not be discernable given the location of the viewer (for example, facilities such as landfill gas flares are located in the center of the site and are not visible in the visual simulations). The landfill would have 20-foot wide benches required for the final landfill cap, but from the distance and angle of the visual simulations, these benches would not be discernable. Revegetation will be guided by requirements specified in Mitigation Measure BR-1, Closure Revegetation Plan, and the Preliminary Closure and Post Closure Plan required by California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery for the site. These requirements will help ensure that revegetated landfill slopes will closely match vegetation on existing surrounding slopes as shown in the visual simulations in the Draft EIR. This vegetation will blunt the look of the benches.

With regard to the "repair" of the Travel Village sign between the existing condition and simulated view, the "after" simulation for Figure 15-12 in the Original Draft EIR depicts a "repaired" sign for Travel Village because it is a simulated view for a future cumulative project scenario, and it is assumed that Travel Village has or will have repaired the sign. CCL did not repair the sign and will not be repairing it in the future. Further, the view of CCL from Travel Village has changed significantly from that shown in the Original Draft EIR. Figure VS-3 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Visual Supplement shows the current existing condition view of CCL from Travel Village, and the Visual Supplement demonstrates that there are no longer views of CCL, existing or future, from Travel Village because of a newly constructed sound wall associated with the State Route 126/Commerce Center Drive improvements.

Regarding the request to verify the dimensions of simulated buildings, the buildings shown in the "after" simulation for Figures 15-11 and 15-12 are based on information provided by Newhall Land and Farm (NLF).

Buildings are also shown in the "after" simulation for KOP 8. This simulation is based on best available information from the preliminary site plans shown for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan as well as building types of the style being constructed in the vicinity of CCL.

#### 27d. Cumulative Impacts

#### **Summary of Comments**

Commenters suggested that visual impacts may be significant and unavoidable with respect to the proposed Newhall Land and Farming development immediately west and south of CCL. Mitigation measures should be proposed to minimize the view of the landfill and/or Mixed Organics Composting operation from these future residential developments.

#### Response

The Original Draft EIR evaluated potential views of the landfill from the west, east, and south of the landfill. KOPs 3, 4, and 5, described in the Original Draft EIR, Chapter 15, Visual Resources, show these views. The most applicable of these views related to the proposed NLF developments is KOP 4, which is a view of CCL from the south side of SR-126 at Wolcott Way, which is a future ingress/egress for NLF developments. The Original Draft EIR found that future views from these locations would be less than significant.

In addition, the Proposed Project includes lighting design that will ensure that the Project has minimal visibility during nighttime hours. The lighting design will contribute to minimizing potential views from future NLF developments. Further, development of CCL is proposed in phases that would move landfill development to the north over time, away from SR-126 and proposed developments south of SR-126. The Proposed Fill Module Layout Plan, shown in Figure 2-7 of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Chapter 2, Project Description, shows that development of fill areas in the southern portion of the site would occur before fill activities in the East Canyon. Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Section 2.2.5.3, Entrance and Support Facilities Construction, states that:

- Construction of the site entrance and associated support facilities will occur following project approval, and will take approximately 10 months to complete
- It is estimated that construction will be completed within 2 years following issuance of all required project approvals and resolution of any legal challenges related to those approvals

Draft EIR Chapter 15, Visual Resources, Section 15.6.3, Changes Associated with the Proposed Project, states that:

- Entrance construction would likely occur immediately upon project approval (according to the constraints identified above), which would allow fill activities to commence to the south
- Initial fill activity would move southward from the existing permitted fill area into the South Footprint before it moves into the East Canyon (with the goal to finish filling in the South footprint before significant development occurs at Newhall Ranch)
- A berm and/or screening wall would be constructed along the west side of Wolcott Way, along the entire access road as it parallels SR-126

This combination of phasing between CCL and NLF with shielded lighting to minimize nighttime views from NLF will help ensure that impacts to Visual Resources from future NLF are less than significant, similar to those described in the Original Draft EIR.

The Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Visual Supplement included a visual simulation of CCL from the Newhall Ranch Homestead Village development (KOP 9, Figure VS-10). As stated in the Visual Supplement, "the increased maximum final elevation of the expanded landfill for the Proposed Project would be visible from KOP 9, but following landfill closure, the revegetated landfill would represent an improvement in view over the existing view. Further, the engineered fill of the landfill would not block background ridgeline views, further reducing the potential for visual impacts." Visual resource impacts associated with the Proposed Project from KOP 9 were found to be less than significant, requiring no mitigation.

## 27e Explanation of Significance Conclusions

#### **Summary of Comments**

Commenters stated their belief that visual impacts are significant and unavoidable, rather than less than significant.

#### Response

The determination of whether or not the proposed project's visual effects would have a significant impact was based on a systematic analysis that applied the significance criteria that are defined by the Guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Under the CEQA Guidelines, the mere visibility of a project from one or more viewpoints does not by itself constitute a significant visual impact. The key question that the CEQA Guidelines poses for establishing whether a project's impacts are significant is: "Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?"

To answer the question of whether a substantial degradation would occur, the analysis used simulations to document the visual changes that the project would make to the existing views from each of the viewpoints analyzed. These changes were then evaluated in terms of a range of factors that considered how much of the view would be affected by the visual changes, what the nature of those changes would be, and the extent to which the changes would block views toward important visual features or would change the existing the levels of vividness, unity, and intactness of the view or would alter the view's visual character.

In addition, in making a final determination of the significance of the visual change, the sensitivity of the view was taken into account. Views considered to be most sensitive are those that are seen by large numbers of people for extended periods of time, particularly when they are seen from residential and recreational areas. Views considered to have lower levels of sensitivity are those seen by smaller numbers of viewers, which are seen for short periods of time (for example, when there is a fleeting glance seen by a motorist traveling down a road), and when they are seen from places like commercial and industrial areas where it is reasonable to assume that the attention of the users of those areas is less likely to be less focused on the surrounding scenery.

The assessment of the view from the entrance to the Del Valle Emergency Training Center on Chiquito Canyon Road (KOP 8, evaluated in the Visual Resources Supplement) provides a good case in point of how the criteria for evaluating the significance of the visual impacts were applied. In this view, the landfill would be readily visible, but it would not block views toward important landscape features. In addition, the form, line, color, and texture of the closed landfill would be generally similar to those of the existing elements of the view. Although there would be some reductions in the existing levels of vividness, unity, and intactness of this view, these reductions would not be so great as to substantially degrade the view's existing visual character and quality. Furthermore and very importantly, the visual sensitivity of this view is low. The view depicted in the existing condition and visual simulation images is

the view taken directly in front of the Emergency Training Center, a specific view that would be seen by relatively few viewers. In this vicinity, there are no residential or recreational areas with similar views toward the landfill site, and there are no other areas that would have sustained views toward the landfill. The effect of the visual changes on the experience of travelers on Chiquito Canyon Road would be limited. The view looking toward the proposed landfill would be somewhat outside the primary cone of vision of these travelers and would be seen for very short periods of time as they travel along the segment of the road where this view is available. When all of these factors are taken into account, the final determination is that although the project would be visible in this view, its impacts would be less than significant.





APPROVED

RDH

0

## **CCL** Topical Responses

## 19. Project Need

#### **Summary of Comments**

Generally, comments received focused on requests to justify the Proposed Project need. One comment was received stating that according to the Los Angeles County Siting Element (Volume II, Appendix 1- D) prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) Environmental Program Division in June 1997, there is no landfill capacity shortfall in Los Angeles County at this time. Several comments were received stating that the analysis to justify the project need is outdated due to recently approved legislation and that the need for additional disposal capacity be re-evaluated to reflect the following legislation:

- Assembly Bill (AB) 939
- Senate Bill (SB) 1016
- AB 341
- AB 32
- AB 1594
- AB 1826
- SB 498

#### Response

The Los Angeles County Siting Element referenced in one comment was prepared in 1997. The analysis contained in the 1997 Siting Element is outdated and no longer accurate (LACDPW, 1997).<sup>1</sup> The Original Draft EIR relied on the 2012 Annual Report to the Countywide Integrated Management Plan prepared by the LACDPW, which had the most current data regarding disposal and capacity rates for the County at the time the Original Draft EIR was released for public review.

The evaluation of the need for the project in the Original Draft EIR took into consideration the requirements of AB 939, AB 341, SB 1016, and AB 32, while also evaluating other competing policies. These bills are discussed in both Original Draft EIR, Chapter 1, Introduction and Chapter 18, Project Alternatives. AB 1594, AB 1826, and SB 498 were all signed into law following release of the Original Draft EIR for public review in July 2014. The overall goals of these bills are aimed at maximizing the amount of waste diverted from landfills.

There has been a great deal of activity in California's legislature with regard to phasing out the land disposal of organic waste and encouraging organic waste recycling programs and alternative and/or conversion technologies for the treatment of waste. Given this, the Proposed Project relies on LACDPW's assessment of waste disposal capacity for Los Angeles County, rather than an assessment of individual pieces of legislation, to determine the need for the Proposed Project. The 2015 Annual Report

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW). 1997. *City of Santa Clarita Circulation Element, Amendment Final Environmental Impact Report.* October.

to the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (LACDPW, 2016<sup>2</sup>) addresses AB 939, AB 341, SB 1016, AB 32, AB 1594, AB 1826, and SB 498.

The 2015 Annual Report was used to update the discussion of need for the Proposed Project (LACDPW, 2016). The discussion of Proposed Project need from the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR (Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.4) is included below in its entirety:

LACDPW prepares an Annual Report to the County of Los Angeles CIWMP. The 2014 Annual Report evaluates seven scenarios assuming various capacity options that are currently available or may become available in the future (e.g., existing in-County landfill capacity, import/exports, out-of-County disposal facilities, diversion, alternative technologies, etc.) to assist the County in meeting the Daily Disposal Demand for the planning period, from 2014 to 2029. All seven scenarios assume an increase in diversion rate considering all jurisdictions in the County are required to comply with new state law such as the mandatory commercial recycling and diversion of organics from landfills. The report concludes that in order to maintain adequate disposal capacity, jurisdictions in the County must continue to pursue all of the following strategies:

- Maximize Waste Reduction and Recycling
- Expand Existing Landfills
- Study, Promote, and Develop Alternative Technologies
- Expand Transfer and Processing Infrastructure
- Out-of-County Disposal (including Waste-by-Rail)

The 2014 Annual Report (LACDPW, 2015) specifically identifies several areas in which the Proposed Project supports the waste management needs of Los Angeles County. These are summarized below:

- "To meet disposal capacity needs during the planning period, jurisdictions in the County must..., if found to be environmentally sound and technically feasible, expand in-County Class III landfill capacity."
- *"Expanded landfill capacity is necessary, provided it can be done in a technically feasible and environmentally safe manner."*
- "The County acknowledges that although all the scenarios assume an increase in diversion rate, there will be significant challenges in developing the processing capacity needed by the 2020 deadline. Therefore, maintaining adequate reserve (excess) capacity will be essential in ensuring that the disposal needs of the County are met throughout the 15-year planning period."

The 2014 Annual Report also includes an update to the Countywide Siting Element (CSE), a component of the County General Plan. The current CSE revision includes the proposed expansion of two in-County Class III landfills – Chiquita Canyon and Scholl Canyon Landfills – in order to increase landfill capacities within the County (LACDPW, 2015).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LACDPW). 2016. *County of Los Angeles Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan 2015 Annual Report, Countywide Summary Plan & Countywide Siting Element*. December.

The Proposed Project includes a 560 ton per day mixed organics processing/composting facility and a Set-Aside for a Future Waste Conversion Facility. Both of these project elements support the County's goals to promote, encourage, and expand waste diversion activities at disposal facilities, to reduce or remove organic material from landfills, to develop additional in-County solid waste management infrastructure for composting and anaerobic digestion facilities, and to assist jurisdictions in achieving higher diversion rates.

Subsequent to release of the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR for public review on November 9, 2016, LACDPW issued the 2015 Annual Report to the CIWMP (LACDPW, 2016). The 2015 Annual Report draws the same conclusions as the 2014 Annual Report used to update the Proposed Project need, which is that in-County landfills (including Chiquita Canyon Landfill) should be expanded, if found to be environmentally sound and technically feasible, and that expansion of existing in-County landfills is an important part of Los Angeles County's overall waste management strategy for the next 15 years.

Both the 2014 and 2015 Annual Reports also update the countywide siting element (CSE), a component of the County General Plan. The current CSE revision includes the proposed expansion of two in-County Class III landfills – Chiquita Canyon Landfill and Scholl Canyon Landfills – in order to increase landfill capacities within the County (LACDPW, 2016).

## Summary of Comments

• Testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing expressed support for the County to use Mesquite Regional Landfill as an alternative to Chiquita Canyon Landfill, stating that all jurisdictions should have to handle their own waste, and claiming incorrectly that Chiquita Canyon Landfill is the second largest landfill in the world.

## Applicant Rebuttal – Mesquite Regional Landfill

The argument being made here seems to be that regional landfills are appropriate, as long as they are located somewhere other than at Chiquita Canyon or in the Santa Clarita Valley.

The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR)<sup>1</sup> evaluated use of Mesquite Regional Landfill in Chapter 18, Alternatives, Section 18.3.5, Alternative F: Rail Haul Transport to out-of-County Landfills. The evaluation of this alternative found that Alternative F neither avoids nor substantially lessens the effects associated with air quality, or other potential environmental impacts, when compared to the Proposed Project. The evaluation also found that Alternative F does not have sufficient infrastructure in place to be implemented in the near term, nor is it currently economically viable.

Mesquite Regional landfill is owned by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District, District No. 2 (LACSD). It was developed over the last decade and is currently in a state of suspended animation. It is not the case that Mesquite Regional Landfill is not used because there is too much landfill capacity within Los Angeles County. To the contrary, Los Angeles County already exports nearly half its waste to out-of-County landfills. Even with so much exportation of waste out-of-County, the waste is still not going to Mesquite Regional Landfill. Even LACSD, which owns Mesquite Regional Landfill, sends its waste to other landfills in Orange County.

Simply put, at this time, it is far too expensive to operate Mesquite Regional Landfill. Pricing would need to be in the range of \$80 to \$100 per ton, and the current market rate is approximately \$25 per ton for disposal. The LACSD acknowledged in 2013 that disposal at Mesquite Regional Landfill is not currently feasible by signing a disposal contract with Orange County and extending that contract with Orange County in 2016 for at least 10 more years. According to the minutes for the Board of Directors' for District No. 2, that District approved the contract on April 26, 2016.

With respect to the contract, LACSD and the County of Orange (County) entered into a Municipal Solid Waste Importation Agreement (Agreement) on May 14, 2013, allowing the Districts to deliver solid waste to the County's disposal system. The Districts began delivering waste to the County's landfills from Puente Hills Materials Recovery Facility (PHMRF), Downey Area Recycling and Transfer (DART) Facility, and South Gate Transfer Station (SGTS) after closure of Puente Hills Landfill on October 31, 2013. On February 25, 2014, Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement was executed to increase the Districts' tonnage commitment from 255,000 to 648,210 tons per year. The Agreement was scheduled to terminate on June 30, 2016. Orange County offered to amend the Agreement with the Districts to extend the term for an additional nine years. LACSD determined that continued use of the County's disposal system would be the most cost-effective long-term option for the Districts. Amendment No. 2 will extend the Agreement to June 30, 2025 and commit all residual waste from PHMRF, DART, and SGTS for the full term of the agreement, with the exception of 2,500 tons per month already committed to the El Sobrante Landfill. Starting on July 1, 2016, the LACSD will pay \$25.25 per ton (Consumer Price Index adjusted annually) for disposal in Orange County.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report.* Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.

## Applicant Rebuttal – Jurisdictions Should Handle Their Own Waste

The opposite argument to the one above regarding Mesquite Regional Landfill was also expressed by testifiers, namely that regional landfills are not appropriate and instead there should be many small landfills in Los Angeles County – one for each jurisdiction.

Technically, all jurisdictions in Los Angeles County do handle their own waste – by contracting with various haulers to collect and dispose of waste generated within those jurisdictions. In 2016, approximately 1.4 million tons of the approximately 9 million tons of solid waste disposed of at landfills located within and outside Los Angeles County was disposed of at Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

However, what this commenter seems to mean is that each individual jurisdiction should have their own landfill. Los Angeles County consists of 88 jurisdictions plus unincorporated County areas. By this commenter's logic, there would be at least 89 municipal solid waste landfills in Los Angeles County. Instead, there are 9 landfills that serve the County's more than 10 million residents.

As described in the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery's (CalRecycle) <u>State of</u> <u>Disposal in California Updated 2016</u>:

California's landfills are regulated by strict state and federal standards to protect the environment and public health and safety. Federal regulations set forth by 40 CFR Part 258 (Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) strictly regulate landfills to better project groundwater and air quality. California has its own operation, design, permitting requirements, and minimum operating standards for landfills to protect the environment and public health. Due to the cost of building and maintaining landfills that meet these requirements, many smaller, publicly owned landfills have closed, and larger, privately owned landfills have become more common in the state.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has also recognized a nationwide trend in solid waste disposal toward the construction of larger regional landfills. Economic considerations, influenced by regulatory and social forces, are compelling factors that have likely led to the closure of many existing sites and to the idea of regional landfills. Since the 1980's, the number of active MSW landfills in the United States has decreased by approximately 75 percent (from ~7,900 in 1988 to ~1,900 in 2009) (https://www3.epa.gov/ttnecas1/regdata/EIAs/LandfillsNSPSProposalEIA.pdf).

As you can see from the above, it is infeasible for a number of reasons for each jurisdiction in Los Angeles County to own and operate their own solid waste landfill.

# Applicant Rebuttal – Chiquita County Landfill is the Second Largest Landfill in the World

- Even if Chiquita Canyon Landfill were granted a permit for the tonnage requested and evaluated in the EIR, it wouldn't even be the largest landfill in Southern California.
- Strict regulation of California's landfills means that it is expensive to build and operate landfills, and larger, privately-owned landfills are the result.

Based on the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Solid Waste Information Management System, the daily permitted capacity at Sunshine Canyon Landfill in Los Angeles County is 12,100 tons per day and El Sobrante Landfill in Riverside County is 16,054 tons per day.

It should be further noted that landfills in California are restricted by daily tonnage limits, while landfills in every other state are typically not restricted by daily limits. Therefore, it is impossible to compare the Proposed Project, which requested 12,000 tons per day, to landfills throughout the United States and the world without a daily tonnage limit.

## Summary of Comments

- Testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing referenced the proximity of schools to Chiquita Canyon Landfill, and stated that the project would result in an increased cancer risk and other adverse health impacts to school children.
- Commissioner Smith requested additional information regarding the proximity of schools to the landfill.

## Applicant Rebuttal

- There are two private or charter schools and a Head Start facility located within a 1-mile radius of the landfill; an additional 25 educational facilities are located within a 1-mile to 5-mile radius.
- Two more schools are proposed within 2 miles of the landfill one is associated with the proposed Landmark Village project and would potentially be located just south of the existing landfill entrance, across State Route 126; and the other school is associated with the proposed Mission Village project and would potentially be located southeast of the landfill, across State Route 126.
- Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and testifiers at the Regional Planning Commission Hearing are incorrect regarding the potential for health risk impacts to sensitive receptors, including schools.
- Schools in the Live Oak area are identified as the nearest existing sensitive receptors, but the Final EIR<sup>1</sup> found less than significant human health impacts to these receptors resulting from the Proposed Project.
- There is no location where the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts to human health, including nearby sensitive receptors (schools and residences).
- See also Applicant Rebuttal 1 Air Quality

### Attachments

• Figure 1, Educational Facilities within 5 Miles

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LADRP). 2017. *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision Final Environmental Impact Report*. Project No. R2004 00559 (5). SCH No. 2005081071. Project Proponent: Chiquita Canyon Landfill. Prepared by CH2M HILL, Inc. February.



#### LEGEND

- Project Boundary
- Public Elementary Schools
- Proposed Public Elementary Schools
- Public Middle Schools
- Public High Schools
- ▲ Early Childhoold Education and Head Start
- Private and Charter Schools

| Public Elementary Schools                                  |
|--|
| 1. Bridgeport Elementary School                            |
| 2. Castaic Elementary School                               |
| 3. Charles Helmers Elementary School                       |
| 4. Live Oak Elementary School                              |
| 5. Northlake Hills Elementary School                       |
| 6. Oak Hills Elementary School                             |
| 7. Pico Canyon Elementary School                           |
| 8. Stevenson Ranch Elementary School                       |
| 9. Tesoro del Valle Elementary School                      |
| 10. West Creek Academy                                     |
| Proposed Public Elementary Schools                         |
| 11. Unnamed Proposed School                                |
| 12. Unnamed Proposed School                                |
| Public Middle Schools                                      |
| 13. Castaic Middle School                                  |
| 14. Rancho Pico Junior High School                         |
| 15. Rio Norte Junior High School                           |
| Public High Schools  |
| 16. Academy of the Canyons                                 |
| 17. Castaic High School                                    |
| 18. Learning Post High School                              |
| 19. Valencia High School                                   |
| 20. West Ranch High School                                 |
| Early Childhoold Education and Head Start                  |
| 21. Castaic/Val Verde Hs/Sps                               |
| 22. Family Focus Resource Center - Santa Clarita Valley    |
| 23. Non-RIS Preschool CMS                                  |
| Private and Charter Schools                                |
| 24. Albert Einstein Academy for Letters, Arts and Sciences |
| 25. iLEAD Innovation Studios                               |
| 26. Legacy Christian Academy                               |
| 27. Lighthouse Academy Inc.                                |
| 28. Mission View Public                                    |
| 29. Santa Clarita Valley International                     |
| 30. Trinity Classical Academy                              |

Figure 1. Educational Facilities within 5 Miles *Chiquita Canyon Landfill Master Plan Revision* 



\\galt\proj\chiquita\MapFiles\2017\Schools\_170310.mxd

## Summary of Comments

• A resident of West Los Angeles sent a letter to the Regional Planning Department claiming that soils containing PCBs from Malibu schools were accepted at the landfill.

## Applicant Rebuttal

- Chiquita Canyon Landfill (CCL) is a Class III landfill and accepts only non-hazardous solid waste for disposal. CCL is monitored and regulated by a variety of federal, state, regional and local government agencies to ensure compliance with rules and regulations regarding prohibited waste.
- CCL is fully permitted to accept a variety of non-hazardous Special Waste as outlined in its Waste Acceptance Plan that was approved by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).
- Analytical data for any potential non-hazardous special waste is reviewed and compared to the criteria in the Waste Acceptance Plan before it is approved for acceptance at CCL.
- Background on the Waste Acceptance Plan is provided below:
  - On March 3, 2011, the RWQCB adopted Order No. R4-2011-0052, which amended the waste discharge requirements (WDRs) for ten active municipal waste landfills in the Los Angeles Region, including CCL. The Order serves as the WDRs for the disposal of non-designated/non-hazardous contaminated soils and the onsite use of non-hazardous contaminated soils or related wastes at municipal solid waste landfills. The stated purpose of the Order is "...to develop consistent acceptance criteria for nonhazardous contaminated soils and related wastes" that meet the RWQCB's goal of "...providing water resources protection, enhancement, and restoration while balancing economic and environmental impacts." The Order defines contaminated soils as soils that are impacted by pollutants listed in the WDRs, but in low enough concentrations that the soil is not a designated or hazardous waste.
  - This Order amended the existing WDRs for CCL (Order No. 98-086) and requires that a Waste Acceptance Plan be developed, and approved by the RWQCB Executive Officer, for any landfill that accepts contaminated soils. The Waste Acceptance Plan includes procedures for obtaining and approving soil profiling information, testing procedures for waste constituents accepted, and site-specific threshold levels for all appropriate wastes accepted (for disposal or reuse).
- Soil from the Malibu school site was transported to the landfill over nine days between July 15 and August 24, 2011. The waste material was profiled and approval was received before any transportation activities commenced. Based on analytical results of the investigation samples, the soil excavated from the school site was classified as non-hazardous soil.

## Sunshine Canyon Landfill, A Message from our Future

3/1/2017 - Submitted by Members of Citizens for Chiquita Canyon Landfill Compliance - c4cclc@gmail.com

The Chiquita Canyon Landfill is in the final stages of seeking approval for an expansion, so you may have been hearing about it a lot lately or for the first time. As the upcoming public hearing is Wednesday March 1st, 6pm at Rancho Pico Junior High School [ 26250 Valencia Blvd. Stevenson Ranch 91381] the landfill has shifted into overdrive to get as many positive messages out there as they possibly can. However, there is one message which we should all pay very close attention to; how the nearby Sunshine Canyon Landfill went through a similar expansion that has impacted the nearby communities of Granada Hills and Sylmar.

Let's start with getting caught up on each project's specifics.

#### A Brief Comparison of Sunshine Canyon Landfill and Chiquita Canyon Landfill

| SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL (current)  | CHIQUITA CANYON LANDFILL (proposed)   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| Class III landfill (i.e., a municipal landfill that is not authorized to accept hazardous waste) <sup>1</sup> | Class III landfill (i.e., a municipal landfill that is not<br>authorized to accept hazardous waste) Plus a<br>Household Hazardous and Composting Facility |  |  |
| 363 acres   | 400 acres + 143 feet vertical increase to pile  |  |  |
| 8,300 tons per day  | 12,000 tons per day   |  |  |
| Nearest Residence: .3 miles <sup>2</sup>  | Nearest Residence: 900 fee) #1  |  |  |
| Nearest Commercial Business (minus onsite): 761 feet<br>(north) .8 miles (south)                              | Nearest Commercial Business (minus onsite): 500 feet<br>(east)  |  |  |
| Nearest School: Van Gogh Elementary - 1 mile  | Nearest School: Santa Clarita Valley International<br>Charter School (SCWi)C.8 miles (Proposed Landmark<br>Village Elem. (500 feet) #2                    |  |  |

At first glance, these two landfills have a few similarities although Sunshine is slower shaller than an expanded Chiquita, taking in less tonnage and farther away from residences and schools. They also both sit at gateways to the Santa Clarita Valley, Sunshine at the south and Chiquita to the north. Sunshine is nestled south of the 5 freeway intersection with the 14 Hwy, Chiquita just west of the 5 freeway on the 126 Hwy. In fact, you may have already smelled either of these landfills from the 5 on your commute and did not know its source.

## **Applicant Rebuttal**

#1

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) states:

Much of the area surrounding Chiquita Canyon Landfill consists of undeveloped open space as a result of steep topography. Surrounding land uses include primarily open lands to the north and rural residential development to the west and northwest along Chiquita Canyon Road and in the Val Verde area. The closest of these residential dwellings is located approximately 500 feet from the northwest site boundary and 1,200 feet from the landfill footprint, and intervening topography prevents residential views of the operating landfill from these locations.

#### #2

Santa Clarita Valley International Charter School (SCVi) is approximately 1 mile from the edge of the proposed waste footprint for the landfill expansion.

#### #3

The school proposed as part of Newhall's Landmark project is more than 2,000 feet from the edge of the proposed waste footprint associated with the landfill expansion, and across State Route 126.

#### #4

Sunshine Canyon Landfill in 2016:

- Permitted for 12,100 tons of all inbound material
- Accepted 8,300 tons per day average of all inbound material
- Received 31 Notices of Violation for odor nuisance

Chiquita Canyon Landfill in 2016:

- Permitted for 6,000 tons of waste and unlimited diverted material
- Accepted roughly 9,400 tons per day average of all inbound material
- Received zero Notices of Violation for odor nuisance

There is clearly no connection between tons of material received and Notices of Violation for odors.

#### #5

It is entirely likely that one has smelled Sunshine Canyon Landfill during their daily commute, particularly along Interstate 5 (I-5). With over 10,000 odor complaints and 205 Notices of Violation for odor in the last 8 years, Sunshine Canyon Landfill is a known odor source. Both Sunshine Canyon Landfill's location adjacent to I-5 and its topographic features contribute to odor movement toward people's commute. This is not the case at Chiquita Canyon Landfill.

We are unaware of anyone ever complaining of smells from Chiquita Canyon Landfill during their daily commute. There are zero odor complaints and zero Notices of Violation for odors associated with Chiquita Canyon Landfill identified along any transportation corridors.

#5

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/compliance/sunshine-canyon-landfill

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> http://bit.ly/SunshineCynLandfill



A scale comparison of Dodger Stadium to the size of the expansion being proposed at Chiquita Canyon Landfill

## What we can learn from Sunshine Canyon Landfill

#### HOW BAD 8,000 TONS A DAY SMELLS

Since its expansion, Sunshine has been reeling with public outcry regarding odors and traffic. Searching "sunshine canyon landfill odors" pulls up dozens of articles and case hearings written about how bad it is for residents there. Sunshine has received 119 odor violations since 2014 averaging about 30 a year.<sup>3</sup> To anyone who lives next to a landfill this is an incredible number because they know how hard it is to get a violation. You may think agents regularly track odors at landfills but in reality it is largely up to us the citizens to regulate odors and it is a very difficult process to get a violation.

Here is the process for reporting odors to the Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), the agency in charge of air quality:

- 1. They must receive 6 calls in one hour (it was 3 late last year but has returned to 6)
- 2. An agent comes out often from Diamond Bar, CA to verify the odor (or not at all due to low staffing)
- 3. The agent then goes to each complaint's address to smell the air.
- 4. After the same odor is verified at all 6 locations they then go to the landfill to verify if the air smells the same.

<sup>3</sup> http://www3.aqmd.gov/webappl/fim/prog/novnc.aspx?fac\_id=49111

#### #6

Neither of the landfill areas circled in red are part of the proposed expansion of the waste footprint. These are Primary Canyon and Canyon B, and they are older, closed areas of the landfill.

#7

"Dodgers Stadium to Scale" appears to be incorrect. The Dodger Stadium Complex is approximately 300 acres, so less than half a Dodger Stadium Complex could fit inside the expanded waste footprint.

#### 5. If it is indeed the same odor, a notice of violation is given.

This whole process takes hours which often means the odorous gasses may have already moved or dissipated before an agent even arrives. We can only imagine how many calls went unverified if this process was fulfilled 119 times. It also helps to illustrate how bad and how long the odors from Sunshine have to be. Residents in Val Verde, the community closest to Chiquita, already feel it is impossible to actually get a violation. Even this past Monday February 27th, calls were made after an agent had already come out and they refused to come back. It takes a lot of community effort and work to make sure the landfills are held accountable for their odors.

#### YOU DON'T HAVE TO LIVE NEXT TO A LANDFILL TO FEEL ITS EFFECTS

Sunshine's odor calls come largely from Granada Hills and Sylmar. The center of both communities sit about 3 miles away from the closest landfill border (the garbage gets dumped in various areas within those borders).<sup>4</sup>



Sunshine Canyon Landfill Proximities to the nearby communities vs. Chiquita Canyon Landfill

If Sunshine's 8,300 tons is impacting residents and businesses 3 miles away we can average that out to about 1 mile reach per 2766 tons. If we apply that to **Chiquita's future impact at 12,000 tons per day, it could reach around 4.3** miles from its borders.

Here is what sits 4.3 miles from the Chiquita expansion border; just north of the Lake Hughes Road exit and the 5 in Castaic, Rio Norte Junior High to the Northeast, the intersection of McBean Parkway and Magic Mountain, and the Poe Parkway and Stevenson Ranch Parkway intersection. That is probably a lot farther into our cities than we all thought about.

<sup>4</sup> http://bit.ly/SunshineCynLandfill

#### #8

#8

Sunshine Canyon Landfill's odor complaint calls come largely from Granada Hills and Sylmar because these are the communities immediately adjacent to the landfill. The distance from the closest landfill border to the center of each community is irrelevant, as odor complaints are not being reported at the center of each community.

#### #9

#9

There is no evidence that Sunshine Canyon Landfill is specifically impacting the centers of Granada Hills and Sylmar, but if there were, that fact is material only to Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

There is no mathematical correlation between tons per day of waste disposed at Sunshine Canyon Landfill and distance for odor complaints, and attempts to apply that math to Chiquita Canyon Landfill is nonsensical.

In February 2017, odor complaints at Sunshine Canyon Landfill appear to have been fairly, evenly divided between odors associated with trash and odors associated with landfill gas. In February 2017, Sunshine Canyon Landfill received 6 Notices of Violation for odor nuisance. The last (and only time in 10 years) that Chiquita Canyon Landfill received a Notice of Violation for odors was in December 2014, as a result of a highly odorous load of green waste, and Chiquita Canyon Landfill remediated the odor within an hour of being notified. Chiquita Canyon Landfill has since implemented an Odorous Load Training Program, and no Notices of Violation have been received since. Chiquita Canyon Landfill has never received a Notice of Violation for an odor associated with landfill gas.

There is simply no comparison that can be made between Sunshine Canyon Landfill and Chiquita Canyon Landfill.



Mile markers at 3 miles and 4.3 miles



General look at distances

#10

Naturally there are other factors to take into consideration such as the east side of the landfill where the natural ridge is the lowest (the garbage pile is hundreds of feet taller than it now) combined with wind direction which very often blows west to east ... right into Santa Clarita. In addition, **Chiquita also reports it will be increasing inbound truck trips to 975 per day (**this number reflects inbound material only, not including vehicles for construction or

#11

#### #10

The landfill is not proposed to be hundreds of feet taller than it is now. Even if Chiquita Canyon Landfill were to receive a permit for the entirety of the Proposed Project, landfill height would only increase by 143 feet, and that height increase would only occur at a small area near the center of the waste footprint, central to the site.

As previously described in response to a similar comment from C4CCLC on the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR:

The surrounding ridgelines and the final elevation of the landfill would be at different heights in different locations.

Surrounding ridgeline heights vary from 1,330 feet above mean sea level (msl) on the west, 1,650 feet above msl on the north, and 1,500 feet above msl on the east. The landfill is generally shaped like a pyramid, but without the very pointed top, thus creating what is typically called the top deck (see Final EIR Figure 2-3, Final Grading Plan). The top deck has a high point and has gradual slopes of 5 percent. The maximum elevation of the landfill (1,573 feet above msl) occurs roughly in the center of the top deck, which is located approximately in the center of the site, not near the boundaries of the site.

Top deck heights very from 1,550 feet above msl on the west (at a distance of approximately 1,300 feet from the west ridgeline), 1,550 feet above msl on the north (at a distance of approximately 1,100 feet from the north ridgeline), and 1,500 feet above msl on the east (at a distance of approximately 1,400 feet from the west ridgeline).

#### #11

The Proposed Project includes a limit of 13,182 tons of all inbound material per day (waste for disposal and beneficial use), which correlates to an estimated 975 trucks per day. Currently, Chiquita Canyon Landfill has a Conditional Use Permit that limits waste disposed to 6,000 tons per day but does not limit materials diverted from disposal. In 2016, Chiquita Canyon Landfill received over 12,000 tons per day of all inbound material 16 percent of the time. As such, the current baseline traffic in the area, RIGHT NOW, is quite similar to the anticipated traffic for the Proposed Project.

facilitation).<sup>5</sup> The pollution and traffic of this many trucks traveling up the 5 to the 126 will be significant, #12 especially considering that trucks already travel from as far as Orange County, and Victorville to Chiquita.

#### SANTA CLARITA WILL HAVE A LOT OF ODOR-FILLED DEVELOPMENTS

It is easy to see many houses and businesses will be in extremely close proximity. What we don't see are the #14 proposed and current projects for development. The IAC Commerce Center, technically in Valencia but buts up to the northeast landfill border, is being developed right now $^{6}$ . It will span a whopping 25 million square feet of industrial and office market space all within 1 mile of the expansion<sup>7</sup>. Likewise, Newhall Land and Farming is working right now to gain approval for the first two phases of their mega development (Landmark Village and Mission Village). It will be the largest development in the United States and sit literally just across the 126 from the dump. The development in its entirety will include over 20,000 homes and a handful of schools.

#13



Chiquita Landfill Expansion comparison with Newhall Land Development both seeking approval right now

One proposed elementary school, Landmark Village Elementary, would be about 417 feet from the current #16 entrance of the landfill on the other side of the 126.

<sup>7</sup> http://www.iaccommercecenter.com

#12

The Final EIR found that traffic impacts associated with the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

#### #13

From 2011 through 2016, Chiquita Canyon Landfill received 98 percent of waste disposed from communities within Los Angeles County. Only 2 percent was received from out-of-County. While it does occasionally happen that Chiquita Canyon Landfill receives waste from outside Los Angeles County, it is rare, particularly because it is not cost-effective for haulers to transport waste long distances.

It should also be noted that in 2015, Los Angeles County exported to out-of-County landfills almost as much waste as was disposed of in-County.

#### #14

Projects proposed for development were fully disclosed and analyzed in the EIR for the Proposed Project.

Final EIR Table 3-1, Chiguita Canyon Landfill List of Cumulative Projects, identified 14 projects in the vicinity of Chiguita Canyon Landfill proposed for development, including the various Newhall Land and Farming Company developments proposed to the west and south of Chiquita Canyon Landfill. These developments are shown in Figure 3-1, Cumulative Projects.

Every resource chapter of the Final EIR (Chapters 4 through 16) evaluated potential cumulative impacts, which would be the potential impacts of the Proposed Project in combination with the likely potential impacts of the cumulative projects.

#### #15

Even if Chiquita Canyon Landfill were granted a permit for the tonnage requested and evaluated in the EIR, it wouldn't be the largest landfill in Southern California. Based on the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Solid Waste Information Management System, the daily permitted capacity at Sunshine Canyon Landfill in Los Angeles County is 12,100 tons per day and El Sobrante Landfill in Riverside County is 16,054 tons per day.

It should be further noted that landfills in California are restricted by daily tonnage limits, while landfills in every other state are typically not restricted by daily limits. Therefore, it is impossible to compare the Proposed Project, which requested 12,000 tons per day, to landfills throughout the United States and the world without a daily tonnage limit.

#16

Please see Applicant Rebuttal 13 - Chiquita Canyon Landfill and Schools.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Chapter 1 -1.6.2 Summary of Operational Baseline and Proposed Project -- Trucks, Table 1-3. Operational Baseline with Proposed Project Truck Trips

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> http://www.scvedc.org/clientuploads/SCV%20Business%20Parks/SCVEDC\_Map\_Insert\_\_CROP.jpg



Landmark Village Elementary School location, with superimposed map images from the Landmark Village EIR.

#### IT WILL AFFECT OUR SCHOOLS, WORKPLACES, AND HOMES

Van Gogh Elementary is 2 miles away from Sunshine Canyon Landfill and had to install charcoal filters in their school to mitigate landfill odors. However, odors still seep into classrooms and hang over the schoolyard.

"The odors that we smell in the morning terrorize our morning routine," said Hindi-Chahayed, president of the parent-teacher organization at Van Gogh Charter School, considered the epicenter for landfill smell. "Kids hold their noses when coming to class. We cannot hold morning assembly."

"The smell is torture," she said.8

This from a school 2 miles away from Sunshine accepting 3,700 tons LESS than what Chiquita is asking for. How bad will it then be for schools like SCVi Charter School which sits *less than a mile* from the future landfill border? How about the kids at Live Oak Elementary or Castaic Middle School? If Van Gogh Charter has filters that can't keep odorous gasses at bay how will we fare when our landfill will be bigger and schools closer? If we survey the surrounding area of the expansion there are 8 schools and preschools 3 miles or less from the future landfill. In fact, 13,228 kids will be going to school or preschool within 5 miles or less of the landfill expansion border<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup>http://www.dailynews.com/environment-and-nature/20160827/the-smell-is-torture-san-fernando-valley-residents-say -of-sunshine-canyon-landfill

<sup>9</sup> Student numbers gathered from 2016 at www.schooldigger.com

#17

There are no landfill-related odor issues at SCVi Charter School, Live Oak Elementary, or Castaic Middle School now, because odors at Chiquita Canyon Landfill do not migrate offsite now. Management of odor at a landfill is site specific and Chiquita Canyon Landfill has demonstrated the ability to operate a landfill that does not affect the surrounding community. The Final EIR includes measures to ensure that the landfill will not result in offsite migration of odors.

Again: Chiquita Canyon Landfill is not Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

| Here they are:                            |                       |                              |  |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| School                                    | Number of<br>Students | Miles from Chiquita Landfill |  |
| Santa Clarita Valley International - SCVi | 933                   | 0.8                          |  |
| Val Verde Head Start - Preschool          | 10-15                 | 0.8                          |  |
| Live Oak Elementary                       | 558                   | 1.1                          |  |
| Castaic Middle School                     | 933                   | 2.02                         |  |
| Castaic Elementary                        | 489                   | 2.2                          |  |
| Fay's Child Care                          | 14                    | 2.3                          |  |
| West Ranch High School                    | 2,340                 | 2.7                          |  |
| Rancho Pico Jr. High                      | 966                   | 3                            |  |
| Oak Hills Elementary                      | 613                   | 3.05                         |  |
| Sloan Canyon Preschool                    | 40                    | 3.37                         |  |
| Tutor Time Castaic                        | 80                    | 3.37                         |  |
| Valencia High School                      | 3,177                 | 2                            |  |
| Tutor Time Stevenson Ranch                | 120                   | 4.25                         |  |
| Rio Norte Jr. High                        | 1,144                 | 4.5                          |  |
| Sunshine Day Camp                         | 100                   | 4.5                          |  |
| Bridgeport Elementary                     | 968                   | 4.6                          |  |
| Charles Helmers Elementary                | 738                   | 4.6                          |  |

Google map of these schools here: http://bit.ly/ccl5mileschools

#### ODORS ARE MORE THAN JUST AN INCONVENIENCE, THEY ARE HARMFUL TO YOUR HEALTH

We may not consider the health impact of smelling odorous gasses on a regular basis but landfill gasses are extremely dangerous.

"Landfills can produce objectionable odors and landfill gas can move through soil and collect in nearby buildings. Of the gases produced in landfills, ammonia, sulfides, methane, and carbon dioxide are of most concern. Ammonia and hydrogen sulfide are responsible for most of the odors at landfills. Methane is flammable and concentrations have sometimes exceeded explosive levels indoors. Methane and carbon dioxide can also collect in nearby buildings and displace oxygen." -- NY State Department of Health 10

SCVi and Live Oak Elementary specifically are at ground zero as well as residents in Val Verde, the Valencia Commerce Center and along the 126 (future Newhall development). Each have been identified as cancer risk sites within the current Environmental Impact Report. This is not a scare tactic as the landfill has made it out to be, the agency hired to evaluate their project created this information in Figure 11.5-Maximum Health Impact Locations from Proposed Project Construction and Operation.<sup>11</sup> For a searchable map please visit: http://bit.ly/CCLCancerMap

#18

#18

These statements are scare tactics, and there are no locations that are "ground zero" relative to the Proposed Project and human health.

The locations referenced ARE shown in Final EIR Figure 11.5. However, the locations shown are NOT cancer risk sites. The locations shown are the locations of the nearest sensitive receptors to the landfill, for which the analysis shows that there will not be a significant impact to public health from the project.

See Final EIR Topical Response #1, Air Quality and #21, Public Health.

<sup>10</sup> https://www.health.ny.gov/environmental/outdoors/air/landfill\_gas.htm

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8rxv9anzSiieVVYVzEwR0FYbmc/view



Live Oak Elementary, homes in Val Verde, the Travel Village, and the post office will be major epicenters for landfill offgas

#### So how do we avoid another Sunshine Canyon Mess?

Some will probably say that this comparison could cast Chiquita in a favorable light. After all, some of what we are #20 doing is trying to predict the future. For all the promises, research, planning, and PR charming that Chiquita has done throughout the valley and beyond, we can only reply that Sunshine made those promises too. And here we are, with a twisted gift of being able to see where we could end up.

#### WE HAVE TO FIGHT TO SHUT IT DOWN NOW BEFORE IT EXPANDS

After all of the hardship that Granada Hills and Sylmar endure and the massive amounts of odor violations, Sunshine Landfill is only getting a slap on the wrist. Currently all they have received is an odor abatement to reduce their intake to 6,000 tons a day. Now let's take a step back here and consider any other business staying open after receiving 30 violations in the last 3 years...landfills seem to have tremendous leeway when it comes to public health. To try and mitigate the Chiquita Canyon Expansion will mean hours of residents efforts and calls to only have small measures in response. It is an extreme burden on residents and businesses to regulate landfill odors after it has been approved so we must fight to not let this go through as it is proposed!

#### SUPPORT THE VAL VERDE CIVIC ASSOCIATION

The community of Val Verde already saw the writing on the wall in 1997 during the last Chiquita Canyon Expansion...yes this isn't its first expansion and the landfill has been affecting Val Verde for over 40 years now. The #21 Val Verde Civic Association has a memorandum of agreement with the landfill that it would close once it reached 23 million tons or November 24, 2019 whichever occurs first. Chiquita surpassed 23 million tons this past June but the Department of Regional Planning gave them a backdoor option of a clean hands waiver to continue to operate.

#22

There are NO "major epicenters for landfill offgas" associated with the Proposed Project. As stated above, these are the locations of the nearest sensitive receptors to the landfill, for which the analysis found no significant impacts relative to human health from the project.

#### #20

#19

This comparison does cast Chiquita Canyon Landfill in a favorable light, as it should.

It bears repeating: Chiquita Canyon Landfill IS NOT Sunshine Canyon Landfill and its compliance record over the past 10 years clearly demonstrates that fact.

#### #21

#19

During the previous permitting effort for the landfill in 1996, the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) issued a permit for the landfill. That permit was appealed to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) by opponents to the landfill. During the innerving period of time between the RPC hearing and the BOS hearing, the prior landfill owner and the community negotiated an agreement to modify the language in the Conditional Use Permit approved by the RPC. That agreement contained a number of changes and deletions to the RPC permit. The permit at that time allowed the landfill to operate until it "filled in" the grading plan included in the permit. In an attempt to redefine what the grading plan meant in layman terms, one of the changes included adding a tonnage limit (23 million tons), and another added a closure date (November 2019) to the CUP. The agreement was not a standalone contract between the landfill and the community as the opponents promote it to be. It was an agreement to make changes to the RPC-approved CUP that would become part of the CUP approved by the BOS. In both versions of the CUP there was also a condition that clearly allows Chiquita Canyon Landfill to apply for a NEW permit, which is what it has done.

See Final EIR Topical Response #5, Conditional Use Permit and Community Agreement, as well as Applicant Rebuttal 1, Community Agreement.

#### #22

There was nothing "backdoor" about Chiquita Canyon Landfill requesting and receiving from Los Angeles County a limited operational waiver that would allow it to continue operation while the process of evaluating the environmental impacts of the project was completed. The waiver is authorized by County Code Section 22.04.110.

See Final EIR Topical Response #31, Limited Operational Waiver, as well as Applicant Rebuttal 2, County Code Section 22.04.110 Waiver.

What is going on by Sunshine means every single resident in Val Verde will be smelling the landfill on a regular basis and lose their abilities to enjoy their homes just like Granada Hills. Use this agreement in your arguments and support their fight to protect the community from further pollution. Like their facebook page at facebook.com/vvcivic #23

#### ATTEND HEARINGS AND DEMAND YOUR COUNCILS OPPOSE THIS EXPANSION

Tonight is one of the last hearings on the landfill expansion. Landfill supporters have turned it into a partisan issue about supporting a business over the safety and well being of our communities. Please come out to support the opposition of this expansion:

#### Public Hearing on Chiquita Expansion attended by Regional Planning Commissioners\*\*

- Wednesday, March 1, at 6:00pm at Rancho Pico Junior High School, 26255 Valencia Blvd., Santa Clarita, CA 91381 (Limited parking. Rideshare, if possible. Additional parking may be available at the nearby West Ranch High School.)
- \*\*Wear red and a dust mask to show solidarity of opposition to the project

Check into when your local council or HOA meets and have them write in letters of opposition and better yet... get involved! West Ranch Town Council for example, is an avid support of the expansion when 3 of the largest schools are the next closest after Castaic.

#### DEMAND WE START USING THE MESQUITE REGIONAL LANDFILL FOR OUR WASTE NEEDS

Call on LA County to put an end to kicking this can down the road, and make a bold decision to keep our present and future communities from further risk. Do not grant this expansion, and put in place a plan to reduce waste and keep what needs to be in a landfill away from us and other communities. It's time to start using the Mesquite Regional Landfill which half a billion tax dollars were spent to create. The reason we don't use it now? There is too much landfill capacity in LA County. There is no reason for this landfill to expand if a surplus of landfill capacity exists and our dollars are not being used to rail waste out to the desert away from homes and businesses!

#### WRITE LETTERS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

If you aren't able to attend the hearing or even if you can... write your representatives and demand they oppose this landfill expansion! It is vital to use your voice in this fight!

Here is where to send your letters with reference to: Project #R2004-00559-(5)

| 5 Los Angeles County Supervisors:                     | Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning: |
|---|---|
| <ul> <li>Kathryn Barger (213) 974-5555</li> </ul>     | (213) 974-6443                                      |
| <ul> <li>Janice Hahn (213) 974-4444</li> </ul>        | zoningldcc@planning.lacounty.gov                    |
| <ul> <li>Sheila Kuehl (213) 974-3333,</li> </ul>      | rclaghorn@planning.lacounty.gov                     |
| <ul> <li>Mark Ridley-Thomas (213) 974-2222</li> </ul> | rglaser@planning.lacounty.gov                       |
| <ul> <li>Hilda L. Solis (213) 974-4111</li> </ul>     | ogomez@planning.lacounty.gov                        |
| executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov                      | 320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor                  |
| Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration                   | Los Angeles, CA 90012                               |
| 500 W. Temple Street                                  | ~ .   |
| Los Ángeles, CA 90012                                 |   |

#### #23

This is a factually incorrect and nonsensical as described above in several of the previous rebuttal statements. This is clearly an inflammatory statement, intended to scare people who don't take the time to research the facts.

#### #24

#24

Mesquite Regional Landfill is owned by the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD), District No. 2. It was developed over the last decade and is currently in a state of suspended animation.

Mesquite was not paid for with tax payer dollars. It was funded through disposal revenue and other fees charged to users of the LACSD various landfills and other waste management facilities. There is no surplus of landfill capacity in Los Angeles County. On the contrary, Los Angeles County already exports nearly HALF of its annual waste to out-of-County landfills.

The reason that Mesquite Regional Landfill isn't used is because it would be far too expensive to operate. Pricing at Mesquite Regional Landfill would need to be in the range of \$80 to \$100 per ton, and the current market rate is about \$25 per ton for disposal. The LACSD acknowledged in 2013 that disposal at Mesquite is not feasible by signing a disposal contract with Orange County and extending that contract with Orange County in 2016 for at least 10 more years. According to the meeting minutes for the Board of Directors' for District No. 2, that District approved the contract on April 26, 2016.

#### DON'T GIVE UP AND JOIN US!

Citizens for Chiquita Canyon Landfill Compliance has stayed in the fight and done great work to push back on the landfill's tactics to undermine them. We consist of individuals from all over the Santa Clarita Valley, of ALL political affiliations and interests, so please like our facebook page and join in the efforts to defend our rights to healthy living and work environments. Like our facebook page at <u>www.facebook.com/c4cclc</u> or shoot us an email at c4cclc@gmail.com

We are focused on doing what is right for the community... doubling the capacity of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill is absolutely not. Sunshine Canyon Landfill is all the proof we need.