

1 **4.13 IMPACTS NOT CONSIDERED SIGNIFICANT**

2 This section of the Subsequent EIR provides a discussion of the environmental impacts  
3 of the proposed Tajiguas Resource Recovery Project for issue areas not discussed in Sections  
4 4.1 through 4.12. This discussion focuses on other issue areas and impacts discussed in  
5 previous EIRs (Expansion Project, Reconfiguration Project) where there would be no change or  
6 only minor changes to the impacts relative to the permitted Tajiguas Landfill Project.

7 **4.13.1 Agricultural and Forestry Resources**

8 The Tajiguas Landfill is zoned and designated for agricultural use (see Section 4.8), but  
9 has a waste disposal facility overlay recognizing its use as a landfill. There are no agricultural  
10 uses on the landfill property and the landfill, once closed would not be suitable for agricultural  
11 production. Agricultural activities adjacent to the landfill site are limited to cattle grazing to the  
12 west and orchard operations on the County-owned Baron Ranch which borders the landfill to  
13 the east. The Baron Ranch was purchased by the County specifically to provide a buffer  
14 between the landfill and other agricultural and open space uses. The Resource Recovery  
15 Project would be located on the existing Operations Deck which is disturbed and used for landfill  
16 operations and would be accessed from existing landfill roads. The proposed project would not  
17 displace agricultural lands and is not expected to generate any conflicts with any adjacent  
18 agricultural activities. Continued implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the  
19 Tajiguas Landfill Environmental Documents and various compliance plans (storm water, odors,  
20 litter, vectors, etc.) for operation of the landfill with regards to land use, air quality and nuisances  
21 would continue to minimize conflicts with the ongoing agricultural operations in the area.  
22 Agricultural impacts would remain less than significant (Class III).

23 California Public Resources Code Section 12220 defines forest land as lands that can  
24 support 10 percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural  
25 conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber,  
26 aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.  
27 Based on this definition, the nearest forest land to the Tajiguas Landfill is located within the Los  
28 Padres National Forest, approximately 3 miles north of the project site. All proposed facilities  
29 would be located within the existing landfill site, and would not result in any changes in forest  
30 land zoning or conversion of forest lands or timberlands (Class III).

31 **4.13.2 Paleontological Resources**

32 The Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan does not provide any information  
33 regarding the distribution of paleontological resources. Within the Gaviota Coast Region,  
34 continental terraces, Sisquoc, Monterey, Alegria, and Sespe formations (from the Pliocene and  
35 Miocene eras) are known to contain vertebrate fossils (National Park Service, 2004). In  
36 addition, a record search was conducted of the on-line collections data base of the University of  
37 California Museum of Paleontology. Four genera of marine gastropods (*Ocenebra*, *Conus*,  
38 *Mitra*, *Norrisia*) of the Quaternary Period have been reported from "Tajiguas Reef". Numerous  
39 foraminiferan (small marine invertebrates) collections originate from the project area (Refugio  
40 Canyon, Canada del Capitan).

1 Marine invertebrate fossils have been found at the landfill property in the past and on the  
2 adjacent Baron Ranch. However, the geologic units at the landfill site that contain fossils occur  
3 over a wide region and are commonly occurring and therefore not considered significant or  
4 unique paleontological resources. With the exception of the tank sites, the construction of the  
5 proposed Tajiguas Resource Recovery Project would occur in previously disturbed areas in  
6 engineered fill and on top of the historic waste disposal area where no paleontological  
7 resources occur. Therefore, the project would not impact significant or unique paleontological  
8 resources (Class III).

#### 9 **4.13.3 Energy**

10 As discussed in Section 3.5.5.5, operation of the MRF and AD facility would consume  
11 approximately 6,595 megawatt-hours per year of electricity. However, the proposed roof-top  
12 solar panels and two CHP engines running on bio-gas would generate approximately 14,905  
13 megawatt-hours per year, resulting in a net gain of 8,310 megawatt-hours per year of renewable  
14 energy. Overall, the project would be a net energy producer and the project would represent a  
15 beneficial energy impact (Class IV).

#### 16 **4.13.4 Mineral Resources**

17 Based on the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan Conservation Element,  
18 mineral resources of the County includes oil and gas fields, mercury, diatomite, limestone,  
19 phosphate and sand/aggregate. Offshore gas fields are the closest petroleum resources to the  
20 project site, including the Molino, Gaviota and Caliente fields. No oil or gas wells are located on  
21 the landfill property. The former Shell Hercules gas processing plant site is located 0.2 miles  
22 west of the landfill site, and is undergoing site remediation and clean-up. The proposed RRP  
23 would not conflict with oil and gas production or prevent access to petroleum resources in the  
24 project area (Class III).

25 Mercury, limestone and phosphate mining is not currently conducted on a commercial  
26 scale, and no such resources occur in the project area. The California Geologic Survey has  
27 identified 10 sand/aggregate production areas in Santa Barbara County, with two sites on the  
28 south coast east of the landfill site. Based on the California Geologic Survey's Aggregate  
29 Sustainability in California map (updated 2012), the San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara Production  
30 Area has 25 million tons of permitted sand/aggregate reserves with a 50 year demand of 240  
31 million tons. The proposed RRP would not conflict with sand/aggregate production or restrict  
32 access to these resources in the project area (Class III).

#### 33 **4.13.5 Public Facilities**

34 The proposed project would represent a beneficial impact to public facilities by providing  
35 a 20-year management solution for the region's solid waste disposal needs. The project would  
36 utilize and expand on existing public facilities (electricity, water supplies, drainage, sewage) at  
37 the landfill site, and would not require the construction or expansion of off-site facilities. The  
38 landfill site is located in a remote area, and is provided security services. The proposed RRP  
39 would not significantly increase the demand for police protection services.

40

1            Employment opportunities associated with operating and maintaining the proposed RRP  
2 facilities may generate some demand for health care and educational facilities in the Goleta,  
3 Lompoc and Santa Maria areas. However, this demand would be dispersed over a large  
4 geographical area, such that any demands on a single facility would be negligible. Overall, the  
5 project would not result in significant impacts to public facilities (Class III).

#### 6 **4.13.6 Recreation**

7            Public recreation areas closest to the Tajiguas Landfill include:

- 8            • Arroyo Hondo Preserve operated by the Santa Barbara Land Trust, located west  
9            of the landfill property;
- 10           • Public trail at the County-owned Baron Ranch, located east of the landfill  
11           property; and
- 12           • Refugio, Gaviota and El Capitan State Parks, located along the coast southwest  
13           to southeast of the landfill property.

14           The proposed Resource Recovery Project facilities would be located at the existing  
15 Operations Deck and on the landfill top deck and would not conflict with the use of public  
16 recreational facilities. Employment opportunities associated with operating and maintaining the  
17 proposed RRP facilities may generate some demand for recreational facilities in the Goleta,  
18 Lompoc and Santa Maria areas. However, this demand would be dispersed over a large  
19 geographical area, such that any demands on a single facility would be negligible and  
20 construction of new recreational facilities would not be required. Overall, the project would not  
21 result in significant impacts to recreation (Class III).

22           The landfill site is visible from trails at the Arroyo Hondo Preserve and Baron Ranch,  
23 and the project may result in adverse aesthetics impacts to these trails. These potential  
24 aesthetics impacts are addressed in Section 4.1 of this SEIR.