

identify any impacts to biological resources, there would be no reason or nexus for any mitigation or mitigation fee

The County prepared complete responses to all of the comments received, including those of the City of Brea. The responses to comments addressed the City of Brea's concerns regarding the project. As part of its mitigation strategy, the County engaged in extensive negotiations with the City of Brea in order to develop a new agreement to address the City's concerns. As of this moment, the City and County have been unable to arrive at a mutually acceptable understanding. This means that, in some cases, identified mitigation measures cannot be implemented due to circumstances beyond the control of the County. Because this is an important public project necessary to provide for the public health, safety and welfare by providing cost effective trash disposal within the County of Orange for the benefit of its residents, a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared describing the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project that outweigh the environmental impacts and support the decision to approve the project without mitigation of the impacts that cannot be avoided or reduced to an acceptable level, including all of the elements on which the County and City have been unable to arrive at an acceptable mitigation through development of a new agreement.

The fact that the County and City have not been able to agree on a mutually satisfactory agreement, means that the proposed mitigation of the asserted land use impacts based on that renegotiation cannot be carried out due to circumstances beyond the control of the County. Therefore, those impacts are included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

CEQA requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or location of the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines). Analysis of every possible alternative or options or combination of options would overburden the EIR with an unnecessary amount of detail that would be redundant and complex and would, as a result, fail to provide meaningful information for the County to consider in its review of the project. To develop the alternatives that were analyzed in the EIR, a list of potential alternatives was prepared. For that analysis, the project alternatives were evaluated to determine the extent to which they meet the basic project objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening any significant adverse impacts of the proposed project. In making the following alternatives findings, the Board of Supervisors certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the FEIR, including the information provided in comments on the DEIR and the Responses thereto. The FEIR's discussion and analysis of these alternatives is not repeated in these findings, but the discussion and analysis of the alternatives in the FEIR is incorporated in these findings by reference.

In determining the scope of the alternatives analysis, and the reasonable range of the alternatives to be analyzed, the alternatives in the FEIR were framed by considering the Project objectives, as well as the significant impacts of the Project. The Project objectives are identified in the FEIR and are reproduced below:

- Define future waste disposal system by 2004 to provide a basis for renegotiation of Waste Development Agreements (WDAs) with Orange County cities, franchised haulers and Districts.
- Ensure that the County's near term waste disposal needs are met.
- Maximize capacity of the existing Olinda Alpha Landfill.
- Maintain adequate revenues and local control of waste disposal to provide consistent and reliable public rates and fees
- Maintain efficient, cost effective and high quality IWMD operations.
- Minimize adverse environmental impacts associated with solid waste disposal.

The proposed project was compared to several alternatives, including the No Project Alternative as required by the CEQA. These Alternatives were: Alternative No. 1 – No Project Alternative; Alternative No. 2 – Two Landfill System in 2013 (Prima Deshecha Daily Tonnage Increase); and Alternative No. 3 – Two Landfill System in 2013 (Frank R. Bowerman Daily Tonnage Increase).

The analysis in the EIR concludes that the proposed project will result in some short and long term significant adverse impacts which can not be mitigated to a less than significant level. These unavoidable adverse impacts are exceeding the SCAQMD threshold for PM₁₀ during construction and exceeding the SCAQMD thresholds for NO_x, ROC and CO during operations.

The project, as proposed, represents the culmination of plans applied for by the project proponents and approved by the County of Orange Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The project has been refined to the County's specifications during the course of public review. The project incorporates comments and review from the following:

1. Analysis of the project by staff of various County departments;
2. Analysis of the project by the County of Orange Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors;
3. Responses to the Notice of Preparation;
4. Responses to Comments on the DEIR; and
5. Input from series of meetings conducted by the County with the City of Brea and public review of the project.

4.1 ALTERNATIVE NO. 1 – NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative would include no action by the County of Orange related to changes in landfilling activities, footprint and operations at Olinda Alpha Landfill. Under this

Alternative, the proposed expansion and the extended life of the landfill would not occur. The landfill would continue to operate at its existing permitted capacity and closure date with no increase in long term physical capacity. As such, under this Alternative, the Olinda Alpha Landfill would continue to receive up to an annual average of 7,000 tons per day (TPD) of MSW under the existing MOU between the City of Brea and IWMD and would operate until its permitted closure date of 2013. Under this Alternative, importation of MSW into Orange County landfills would end in 2013.

On closure of Olinda Alpha Landfill in 2013, approximately 1,000 TPD of MSW, which is in excess of what could be accommodated at the Frank R. Bowerman (FRB) and Prima Deshecha Landfills within the existing permitted levels, would have to be accommodated at landfills outside Orange County. Under the No Project Alternative, the maximum daily permitted tonnages at the FRB Landfill and Prima Deshecha Landfill would be the same as existing levels, at 8,500 TPD and 4,000 TPD, respectively. The total permitted landfill capacity in Orange County in 2013, when Olinda Alpha Landfill closes, would be 12,500 TPD ($8,500 + 4,000 = 12,500$ TPD). This permitted system capacity would be approximately 1,000 TPD short of the projected daily tonnage demand of approximately 13,500 TPD in 2021. For the analysis of the No Project Alternative and the alternatives to the proposed project for the Olinda Alpha Landfill expansion evaluated in the EIR, this 1,000 TPD shortfall was assumed. Under the No Project Alternative, this excess tonnage beyond the permit limits would need to be transported out of Orange County for disposal. The projected excess 1,000 TPD of MSW to be exported out of County is based on population projections for the system demand by 2013. Out-of-County landfills would have to be permitted to accept the excess tonnage from Orange County and may include El Sobrante Landfill in Riverside County and/or the Mid-Valley Landfill in San Bernardino County.

4.1.1 Summary of Major Environmental Impacts

Under the No Project Alternative, no change from existing conditions, no expansion and no extension of the life of Olinda Alpha Landfill would occur. This Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative in the vicinity of the landfill because there would be less physical change to existing environmental conditions compared to the proposed project and the project alternatives. However, environmental impacts associated with hauling/disposing of waste at alternate disposal sites would occur. There would be greater impacts related to transportation and circulation, air quality and noise.

There would be greater traffic occurring on road systems leading to the alternate landfill locations for diverted Olinda Alpha Landfill MSW after closure in 2013. Due to the greater travel distance to transport MSW from the Olinda Alpha Landfill service area to other landfills, there would be a greater generation of air pollutant emissions under the No Project Alternative. There may be the potential for adverse increased noise impacts if sensitive receptors are located along the travel routes of trucks hauling MSW in Orange County and on the route to out-of-County landfills.

There would also be an increase in transport and disposal costs (for out-of-County landfills) which cannot be quantified as the costs would be determined by haulers transporting MSW

diverted from the Olinda Alpha Landfill. Although economics is not a consideration under CEQA, one of the primary objectives of RELOOC and the Olinda Alpha Landfill Implementation project is to "...maintain adequate revenues and local control of waste disposal to provide consistent and reliable public rates and fees." With exportation of MSW to out-of-County landfills under the No Project Alternative, that objective is not met.

The No Project Alternative would not meet the following project objectives:

- Define future waste disposal system by 2004 to provide a basis for renegotiation of WDAs with Orange County cities, franchised haulers and Districts.
- Ensure that the County's near term waste disposal needs are met.
- Maximize capacity of the existing Olinda Alpha Landfill.
- Maintain adequate revenues and local control of waste disposal to provide consistent and reliable public rates and fees
- Maintain efficient, cost effective and high quality IWMD operations.
- Minimize adverse environmental impacts associated with solid waste disposal.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 – TWO LANDFILL SYSTEM IN 2013 (PRIMA DESHECHA DAILY TONNAGE INCREASE)

Alternative 2 assumes changes to Prima Deshecha Landfill to accommodate increased MSW as follows:

- Increase permitted TPD at Prima Deshecha Landfill from 4,000 TPD to 5,000 TPD when Olinda Alpha Landfill closes in 2013.
- Permitted TPD at FRB Landfill will remain at 8,500 TPD when Olinda Alpha Landfill closes in 2013.
- Olinda Alpha Landfill continues to accept an annual average of 7,000 TPD until its closure date in 2013.
- No expansion at Olinda Alpha Landfill, present capacity unchanged through remaining life.
- County importation at all three Orange County landfills ceases in 2013, with a net reduction of approximately 2,075 TPD imported to Olinda Alpha Landfill; approximately 830 TPD imported into FRB Landfill and approximately 920 TPD imported into Prima Deshecha Landfill (projected amount for 2013 according to County of Orange - RELOOC Demand Model Runs R1 Thru R5).

Alternative 2 proposes increasing the current permitted TPD at Prima Deshecha Landfill from 4,000 to 5,000 TPD when Olinda Alpha Landfill closes at its currently permitted closure date of

2013. This increase would accommodate projections for the system demand in 2021 based on forecasted population growth and factors in the lower total tonnage with importation ceasing in 2013. At FRB Landfill, the permitted TPD received would remain unchanged at 8,500 TPD. Based on the RELOOC Demand model, approximately 4,900 TPD of Olinda Alpha Landfill MSW would be diverted to the FRB and Prima Deshecha landfills under Alternative 2.

Under Alternative 2, no expansion or extension of the Olinda Alpha Landfill closure date would occur. All importation of out-of-County MSW would cease in 2013 when there is no longer capacity in the system to accommodate imported waste. The Prima Deshecha Landfill 2001 General Development Plan (GDP) remaining refuse capacity would remain unchanged at 77.6 million tons (MT) as of 2001 GDP. However, the incremental increase of the Prima Deshecha Landfill in-flow waste stream from 4,000 TPD to a permitted limit of 5,000 TPD would accelerate its anticipated closure date from 2067 to approximately 2056 based on current population projections and existing disposal technologies. The accelerated closure date to 2056 results in a net reduction of 11 years in the life of Prima Deshecha Landfill under Alternative 2.

Under Alternative 2, the number of truck trips to Prima Deshecha Landfill would increase although the period over which those trips would occur would be reduced by 11 years because the life of the landfill would be shortened under this Alternative.

Under Alternative 2, the existing County MOU with the City of San Juan Capistrano would need to be amended prior to 2013 to provide for the increase in permitted daily tonnage. Similarly, permits currently in place with the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and other regulatory agencies with jurisdictional oversight for Prima Deshecha Landfill would need to be amended.

4.2.1 Summary of Major Environmental Impacts

Alternative 2 would result in impacts similar to the proposed project. However, the incremental increase of the in-flow waste stream at Prima Deshecha Landfill from 4,000 TPD to a daily permit limit of 5,000 TPD would result in greater impacts related to transportation and circulation, air quality and noise under Alternative 2 than under the proposed project.

Alternative 2 would not meet the following project objective:

- Maximize capacity of the existing Olinda Alpha Landfill.

4.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 – TWO LANDFILL SYSTEM IN 2013 (FRANK R. BOWERMAN DAILY TONNAGE INCREASE)

Alternative 3 assumes changes to FRB and Prima Deshecha Landfills to accommodate increased MSW as follows:

- Increase permitted TPD at FRB Landfill from 8,500 TPD to 9,500 TPD when Olinda Alpha Landfill closes in 2013.

- Permitted TPD at Prima Deshecha Landfill remains at 4,000 TPD when Olinda Alpha Landfill closes in 2013.
- Olinda Alpha Landfill continues to accept up to 7,000 TPD until its closure date in 2013.
- No expansion at Olinda Alpha Landfill, present capacity unchanged through remaining life.
- County importation at all three Orange County landfills ceases in 2013, with a net reduction of approximately 2,075 TPD imported to Olinda Alpha Landfill; approximately 830 TPD imported into FRB Landfill and approximately 920 TPD imported into Prima Deshecha Landfill (projected amount for 2013 according to County of Orange - RELOOC Demand Model Runs R1 Thru R5).

Alternative 3 proposes increasing the current permitted TPD at FRB Landfill from 8,500 TPD to 9,500 TPD when Olinda Alpha Landfill closes on its permitted closure date in 2013. This increase would accommodate projections for the system demand in 2021 based on forecasted population growth and factors in the lower total tonnage with importation ceasing in 2013. The permitted TPD at Prima Deshecha Landfill would remain unchanged at 4,000 TPD under Alternative 3. Based on the RELOOC Demand model, approximately 4,900 TPD of Olinda Alpha Landfill MSW would be diverted to the FRB and Prima Deshecha Landfills under Alternative 3.

Under Alternative 3, no expansion or extension of Olinda Alpha Landfill's closure date would occur. All out-of-County importation of MSW would cease in 2013 when there no longer is capacity in the system to accommodate imported waste.

At present, the permitted closure date of FRB Landfill is 2022. Alternative 3 would accelerate the closure date to 2021 based on current population projections and existing disposal technologies. This accelerated closure date for the FRB Landfill results in a net reduction of one year of life at this landfill which just meets the horizon year goal of 2021 for this EIR. After 2021, the County would have only one remaining landfill in the system. Under Alternative 3, the number of truck trips to the FRB Landfill would increase although the duration of the trips would be reduced because the life of the landfill would be shortened by one year.

Under Alternative 3, the County's existing Cooperative Agreement with the City of Irvine would need to be amended prior to 2013 to provide for the increased permitted daily tonnage. Similarly, existing permits with the CIWMB and other regulatory agencies with jurisdictional oversight for these landfills would need to be amended.

4.3.1 Summary of Major Environmental Impacts

Alternative 3 would result in impacts similar to the impacts under the proposed project. However, the incremental increase of in-flow waste stream at FRB Landfill, from 8,500 TPD to 9,500 TPD would result in greater impacts to transportation and circulation, air quality and noise under Alternative 3 than under the proposed project.

Alternative 3 would not meet the following project objective:

- Maximize capacity of the existing Olinda Alpha Landfill.

5.0 COMPARISON OF IMPACTS

Table 5-1 shows a comparison of the environmental effects of the proposed project, the project alternatives and the No Project Alternative. Each of the build alternatives would result in environmental impacts greater than would occur under the No Project Alternative. Therefore, the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, although it would not meet the defined project objectives as discussed earlier. Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines states that if the No Project Alternative is selected as the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmental superior alternative among the other alternatives. Of the remaining alternatives, the proposed project is the environmentally superior alternative.

**TABLE 5-1
COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF ALL PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Parameter	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Land Use and Planning	2	2	2	2
Geology and Soils	2	1	1	1
Hydrogeology and Water Quality	2	1	1	1
Surface Water Hydrology	2	1	1	1
Transportation and Circulation	2	2/3	2/3	2/3
Air Quality	3	2/3	2/3	2/3
Noise	2	2/3	2/3	2/3
Aesthetics	1	1	1	1
Cultural and Scientific Resources	2	2	2	2
Hazards	2	2	2	2
Public Services	1	1	1	1
Biological Resources	2	1	1	1

Legend

1. Insignificant or no impact.
2. Impact that can be mitigated to a level of insignificance.
3. Impact that can not be mitigated to a level of insignificance.

Source: P&D Consultants, Inc. (2004).

Adequacy of the Range of Alternatives Addressed/Analyzed

The Board of Supervisors finds that the range of alternatives studied in the EIR reflects a reasonable attempt to identify and evaluate various types of alternatives that would potentially be capable of reducing the Project's environmental effects, while accomplishing most -- but not all -- of the elements of the Project objective and its corollary implementing measures. The Board of Supervisors finds that the alternatives analysis is sufficient to inform the Board and the public

regarding the tradeoffs between the degree to which alternatives to the Project could reduce environmental impacts and the corresponding degree to which the alternatives would hinder the County's ability to achieve the Project objectives.

6.0. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Per Section 15130(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. *See* CEQA Guidelines at Section 15065(c).

In accordance with the aforesaid mandates, the FEIR analyzes the potential cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. In evaluating the Project's cumulative impacts, the FEIR considered specific projects located within the relevant study area, as well as the adopted general plans for affected local jurisdictions and regional development projections. *See* CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b).

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The proposed expansion of the landfill and the extension of the use of the landfill to 2021 would not result in any cumulative land use impacts. While development around the landfill property represents incremental growth of the area and the intensification of uses incumbent with that growth, the landfill operations would remain the same under both existing conditions and the proposed project. The only change is the landfilling operation would be to continue operations for an additional eight years beyond the previous 2013 closure date. The landfill property is designated as a public facilities use in both the County of Orange GP Land Use Element (LUE) and the City of Brea GP LUE. The extension of landfilling on the landfill property of an additional eight years would not have cumulative impacts on the planned land uses in the City or unincorporated area of Orange County.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The horizontal and vertical expansions of and the extended time period for landfilling operations will require additional fill/cover. This will require importing soil to the site after about 2015. Potential sources for this imported soil will be provided by existing commercial quarries. However, the demand for these cover soils will occur over a limited period lasting only until closure of the landfill in 2021. Soil sources are readily available to provide this material. Therefore, this effect is not considered cumulatively significant.

HYDROGEOLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Section 5.3 (Hydrogeology and Water Quality) concluded that there is a potential for impacts to groundwater as a result of the proposed project. However, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 5.3, the impacts would be considered less than significant. Given

that the LCRS for landfilling operations is subject to approval by the RWQCB-SA and must comply with federal and state requirements (27 CCR), no cumulatively considerable impacts would occur to groundwater as a result of the proposed project.

SURFACE WATER HYDROLOGY

Section 5.4 (Surface Water Hydrology) concluded that there is a potential for impacts to surface flow as a result of the proposed project. However, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 5.4, the impacts would be considered less than significant. Given that the drainage facilities for the landfill expansion will be designed, constructed and operated to accommodate the anticipated volume of precipitation and peak flows from surface run-off under the precipitation conditions specified in Title 27 of the CCR, no cumulatively considerable impacts would occur to surface water as a result of the proposed project. The landfill expansion will continue to operate under an NPDES Permit to discharge storm flows. The project will comply with the criteria and restrictions of the NPDES Permit and the SWPPP and BMPs that accompany that permit.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

As discussed in Section 5.5 (Transportation and Circulation), the daily operations at Olinda Alpha Landfill would not change (i.e. no change in traffic volume associated with the landfill operations would occur), but the interval of time over which those operations occur would be extended. The traffic analysis in Section 5.5 included background traffic and growth based on the buildout of the Brea GP and is consistent with the assumptions of the future circulation system at buildout (the year 2025 in the GP). Therefore, the traffic analysis in Section 5.5 is already inclusive of the cumulative projects and growth in the area through 2021. Refer to Section 5.5 for cumulative traffic impacts.

AIR QUALITY

Emissions associated with cumulative construction are based on the quantity and types of construction equipment working concurrently on any given day during project construction. Estimates of when and what types of equipment used for construction of projects in the local area are extremely speculative. The combined emissions from concurrent construction of cumulative projects would likely exceed the SCAQMD thresholds and would result in a significant adverse air quality impact.

During the operational phase of the project, air pollutant emissions would exceed the SCAQMD operational phase thresholds. As such, the project is considered by the SCAQMD to be a significant source of emissions. Because the South Coast air basin is in nonattainment for ozone and fine particulate matter (PM10) and the proposed project exceeds the SCAQMD thresholds, project emissions would contribute to the nonattainment of these pollutants and thereby result in a significant cumulative impact to air quality.

NOISE

Because the project expansion area is at least 4,250 feet from the nearest off-site sensitive uses, noise associated with construction and daily operations on the project site would have little or no cumulative noise impacts on off-site uses.

Off-site landfill-related traffic, including heavy-duty waste/refuse trucks, would contribute to potentially significant noise impacts due to the 10 to 12 dBA difference with project traffic over the no project scenario. However, existing and proposed homes along the access roads, including Valencia Avenue north of Carbon Canyon Road, have or would be required (by the City of Brea) to have a sound wall along their property line for their outdoor living area so that the 65 dBA CNEL standard is not exceeded. In addition, traffic noise at homes or other sensitive uses along Imperial Highway leading to the project site are or will have been mitigated through sound wall implementation associated with the Imperial Highway Smart Street project. Therefore, no significant cumulative noise impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

No significant vibration impacts were identified for both on-site operations and off-site truck traffic. Therefore, no significant cumulative vibration impacts would occur.

AESTHETICS

As discussed in Section 5.7 (Aesthetics), the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to visual resources or viewsheds after mitigation. Some of the landfilling operations will be visible for short periods of time and as soil stockpiling and grading operations occur, exposed soil will be visible from off-site areas. This will occur with or without the proposed project. The extension of the use of the landfill for landfilling will result in delay in the final revegetation and reclamation of the site by eight years. This additional period of visible operations and exposed soil contributes to the overall aesthetic environment of the area. This contribution is not cumulatively considerable, as it will be mitigated through interim landscaping on-site. Therefore, the project would have no cumulatively adverse impacts related to aesthetics.

CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES

Section 5.8 (Cultural and Scientific Resources) concluded there was a very low likelihood for finding significant resources on the site. Precautionary mitigation measures were added to the project and described in Section 5.8 to ensure that any previously unknown resources on the site would be protected should they be discovered during grading operations. Given the low likelihood of resources being on-site and the fact that other projects in the area are typically subject to similar protective mitigation for cultural and paleontological resources, no cumulatively considerable impacts would occur to these resources as a result of the proposed project.

HAZARDS

Only municipal solid waste (MSW) is accepted at Olinda Alpha Landfill, although limited special wastes (i.e., tires) also are accepted. Hazardous materials such as asbestos, batteries, chemicals, paints, non-autoclaved medical waste and other substances considered hazardous are not accepted. The landfill operates under existing regulations related to hazardous materials and

has standard procedures in the event of hazards which could affect the site such as fire or earthquake. These practices would continue under the extension of landfill operations for an additional eight years for the vertical and horizontal expansions. Additionally, there are no nearby uses which, when considered with the landfill operations, increase any hazard risks on-site or to areas surrounding the landfill property. Therefore, there are no cumulatively considerable impacts on hazards from the expansion of the landfill and the extension of its operations.

PUBLIC SERVICES

The current operations of Olinda Alpha Landfill have minimal reliance on public services. The landfill itself provides a public service and operates in a fairly self-contained manner including on-site fire suppression facilities. As other development in the area occurs, fire and other public services will be expanded to ensure public safety and efficient emergency response times. The extended landfill operations would not increase any demand for public services. While demand for public services in the project area is expected to increase with development, the proposed landfill expansion project does not contribute to that demand and, therefore, does not have cumulatively considerable impacts to public services. As stated in the IS under Section 16 (Utilities and Service Systems), the proposed expansion will provide additional capacity for MSW.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As discussed in Section 5.11 (Biological Resources), the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to biological resources after mitigation. As other development in the area occurs, such as Tonner Hills PC and Olinda Ranch, the potential for cumulative impacts related to biological resources is increased. According to the Tonner Hills PC Draft EIR, that project would result in a beneficial impact for the California gnatcatcher and the least Bell's vireo by resulting in a net increase of 19.5 acres of coastal sage scrub and 2.49 acres of southern arroyo willow woodland. The Tonner Hills PC in conjunction with the landfill expansion would not contribute to adverse impacts to biological resources. The City of Industry owns 2,423 acres of open space to the north of the landfill that will be utilized for municipal use. This area includes Upper and Middle Tonner Canyon, which composes the Puente-Chino Hills wildlife corridor. Municipal use of this area may contribute to the potential for cumulative impacts related to biological resources in the region.

While development in the project area is expected to increase, the proposed landfill expansion would not contribute to cumulative adverse impacts related to biological resources.

7.0 GENERAL FINDINGS

1. The plans for the proposed project have been prepared and analyzed so as to provide for public involvement in the planning and the CEQA processes.

2. To the degree that any impacts described in the DEIR are perceived to have a significant adverse effect on the environment, or such impacts appear ambiguous as to their effect on the environment, any significant adverse effect of such impacts has been substantially lessened or avoided by the mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR or is outweighed by the facts set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC).
3. Comments regarding the DEIR received during the public review period have been adequately addressed in the Responses to Comments Report included in the FEIR. Any significant adverse effects described in such comments were avoided or substantially lessened by the mitigation measures described in the DEIR or are outweighed by the facts set forth in the SOC.

8.0 ABSENCE OF SIGNIFICANT NEW INFORMATION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR for further review and comment when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR but before certification of the final EIR. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the project proponent declines to implement. The Guidelines provide examples of significant new information under this standard. Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

Therefore, the Board of Supervisors hereby finds that no significant new information has been added to the FEIR since public notice was given of the availability of the DEIR that would require recirculation of the EIR.

9.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
2. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible effective mitigation measures or the alternatives identified in the Final Program EIR. The Board of Supervisors has adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations to address this impact of the Project.
3. The Statement of Overriding Considerations contains the complete information on which it is based.

10.0 LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the County's findings and decisions are based are located at County of Orange, Planning and Development Services Department, 300 North Flower Street, P.O. Box 4048, Santa Ana, CA 92702-4048. The custodian for these documents is the Director of the Planning and Development Services Department. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a) (2) and 14 Cal. Code of Regulations Section 15091(e).