

PALA - PAUMA COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP
P.O. Box 1273
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
Phone: 760-742-0426

REGULAR MEETING, OCTOBER 6, 2015
APPROVED MINUTES

Scheduled start time: 7:00 PM

Place: Pauma Valley Community Center
16650 Hwy. 76
Pauma Valley, Ca. 92061

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM.

- a. Roll Call and quorum established: We have four members present: Brad Smith, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Robert Smith and Stephanie Spencer. Andy Mathews, Chairman; Ben Brooks and Jeremy Barbanell were absent.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:

- a. The minutes of September 1, 2015 had been previously submitted to all, corrected and resubmitted for final review. Robert Smith made a motion to approve as presented, Brad gave the second and they were approved 4-0.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION, OPEN FORUM:

- a. This is an informal opportunity for community member comments on any matters of concern within our realm of influence. There were no additional community members present.

4. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. There was only one item on the agenda and that was to provide the County with our comments on a new notice of intent by the owners of the proposed Gregory Canyon Landfill to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) associated with DA No. SPL-2010-00354. The county stated that this was optional since all previous comments would be reviewed again for this resurrected proposal. We had previously been noticed by the county that this was coming and our Secretary, Fritz gathered up all past documents regarding the proposal and Robert Smith volunteered information that his Environmental Expert had found for any comments we might want to make. Fritz reiterated a summary of past concerns and everyone again expressed theirs also. Brad mentioned that in theory the new state water sustainability group should consider a possible pollutant stream into this important water supply effecting the long term sustainability. Fritz moved that Brad craft a thorough summary of our concerns and Stephanie gave the second. The vote was 4-0 in favor. He will submit this summary of our concerns to the County and CC: the Army Corps of Engineers and adjacent planning groups. SEE ATTACHMENT A, Brad's excellent summary for details.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- a. Brad mentioned that the county has a program where anyone wishing can get rain water runoff barrels for only \$10 after the rebate program. See County Works?
- b. There were no expenses or reimbursements to submit.
- c. The next meeting is scheduled for November 3, 2015.

6. **ADJOURNMENT:** Brad moved to adjourn at 7:23 PM and Fritz gave the 2nd. Unanimously carried.

Ref: Attachment A

These minutes were approved at the 3-1-16 meeting. Brad moved to approve, Ben gave the second and they were approved 6-0.

Fritz Stumpges,
PPCSG Secretary

Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group ("PPCSG")

Comments regarding a Public Notice from the Corps of Engineers regarding Gregory Canyon Landfill

At a public meeting of the Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group held October 6, 2015, PPCSG considered a Public Notice from the Corps of Engineers regarding Gregory Canyon Landfill.

No comments were received from the public.

Prior to the meeting, the Notice had been distributed to the Group members for review and consideration. Following a discussion of this item, **all members strongly agreed that the proposed landfill was incompatible with the bucolic, scenic nature of the area, with the General Plan, and would pose much too large of a threat to the essential underground aquifer in the immediately adjacent San Luis Rey River.** The PPCSG has voiced this opinion many times over the years since the landfill was originally proposed, and it holds this opinion even more strongly today.

The Group believes that the specific actions dealt with by the Permit Application, ie, the construction of the bridge and placement of fill material are, in and of themselves, relatively inconsequential. The massively more significant issue for the Corps to consider, as they say they will and must, is the cumulative impact of the construction and operation of the landfill itself.

Key Points

- The Need – Since the landfill was initially envisioned and proposed by its developer, the State laws and regulations and the State’s residents have continued in their progress to reduce the volume of solid waste destined for landfills by a highly successful recycling campaign. Ten to fifteen years ago, recycling was comparatively rare. Today, many people’s weekly trash bin contains much less material than their recycling bins. And the EIR appears not to consider AB 341 which has become law in California. It requires the implementation of commercial and multi-family residential recycling, and sets a state goal of 75% diversion of the waste stream away from landfills by 2020. These actions reduce the need and/or urgency for additional landfill capacity. The societal need for landfill capacity must be less today than envisioned in the past.
- Financial Risk - Another aspect of the issue of need is the issue of financial risk. The developer of this project has demonstrated in numerous ways over recent years the “thin-ness” of their financial backing. What is to become of this company if their projections of revenue that are required to service the debt, operate the landfill and as planned, produce a profit fail to materialize? If, as seems to be the case, the future volume, and therefore, revenue projections are overstated, what will the region be left with? A landfill that may not be needed, cannot be profitably operated and therefore, a bankrupt corporation. That could lead to pollution control systems that might not be maintained and operated, and certainly, to a visual blight.
- Highway Infrastructure Impact – While there is an obvious negative impact of traffic delays and congestion as documented in the previous EIS, a largely overlooked impact is the cumulative negative effect on the actual pavement and subgrade of the anticipated 800 truck trips over SR 76 each day of operation (6 days a week). The EIS states that the current Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on SR 76 adjacent to the landfill is approximately

8500 vehicles per day. Impacts of vehicles on the pavement condition/strength can be measured using an Equivalent Single Axle Load (ESAL) formula. A standard passenger car has an ESAL of .0007, while a 3-axle garbage truck has an ESAL of 1.0. This means one trip by a 3-axle garbage truck causes as much wear and tear on the roadway pavement as 1,429 car trips. Given the project's average garbage truck trips of 800 per day, this equates to the same structural damage to the roadway as would be caused by 114,000 passenger cars per day. In simpler terms, the truck traffic will deteriorate the condition of the roadway on SR 76 at over 14 times the rate caused by the existing traffic load.

- Environmental Justice – Once again, at the time that this landfill was initially proposed, the recognition of the concepts of environmental justice were in their infancy. Today, they are a universally accepted factor. The proposed landfill is located only 1 mile west of the western boundary of the Pala Band of Mission Indian's 12,000 acre Reservation. And it may be within as little as 1000 feet from a site considered to be of cultural, spiritual and religious significance to the Tribe. The Pala Tribe has unwaveringly opposed the landfill, and continues to do so. This project is a nearly perfect example of the issues that fostered the recognition of the validity of the arguments for consideration of Environmental Justice when analyzing the appropriateness of the siting of non-desirable facilities.

And the largest overarching factor:

- Water Quality – The biggest risk of hugely significant negative impact from this project is the risk to groundwater quality. This factor alone should prevent this proposed project from ever becoming a reality.
 - The San Luis Rey River – This river is for all intents and purposes, immediately adjacent to the landfill site. It flows as surface water rarely, only in very large storm events. However, the aquifer that underlies the river continuously carries the rainwater from a huge drainage area that stretches over 20 miles to the east, to Lake Henshaw and at points, the drainage area is as much as 10 miles wide. From the proposed site, the River and the underground aquifer that underlays it, flow about 20 miles further to the west, through Bonsall and Oceanside, discharging into the ocean. All along its length, there are literally hundreds of wells providing drinking and agricultural water, to numerous water districts, farmers and cities. This water source is essential to these communities and residents. Any risk of polluting it so that it couldn't be used is patently unacceptable.
 - Proximity to the River - The San Luis Rey River runs through the proposed site, with the subject of the Corps permit being a bridge to be built approximately 640 feet in length to span the river. The bridge would allow garbage trucks to drive from SR 76, over the river to the landfill, only about 800 feet beyond the bridge. The toe of the landfill appears to be only about 700 feet from the edge of the river.
 - Reliability of Successful Containment - In the long term, it can be accurately stated that sooner or later, the containment will fail and groundwater pollution will occur. Much like when discussing earthquakes, it isn't a matter of IF, it is a matter of WHEN.
 - Seismic Causes – The draft EIS recognizes numerous risks to the integrity of the landfill from Seismic caused movement. It concludes that all of these risks can be successfully mitigated through appropriate design measures. None the less, history

has taught us that Seismic risks, and measures to protect from seismic caused events continue to progress as modern engineering observes the failures of prior “appropriate” designs. Also, the knowledge of the location of faults is not complete. It is a common occurrence for a “new” fault to be discovered. The most obvious recent example is the discovery, the City of Los Angeles within the past couple of years of a previously unknown, significant fault that runs through the heart of Hollywood. And Los Angeles is, along with the San Francisco Bay area, the most seismically studied region in the world.

- Design or Construction Causes – It is not uncommon that liner and leachate recovery systems “properly designed to industry and regulatory standards” and built “according to plan” are subsequently found to have failed. There is a prime local example of this. In 1999, Camp Pendleton contracted with “industry experts” to design and construct an expanded Las Pulgas landfill including a liner and leachate control system. Before its first year of operation was completed, the RWQCB noted irregularities and investigated. They found “discrepancies” between the design and the “as built” construction. After years of investigation, studies, demands, notices and threats of closure by the RWQCB, the Marine Corps embarked on a project to remove the 250,000 tons of waste that had been placed in the landfill, to remove the membrane, to remove the leachate control system and to “properly rebuild”. That project was due to be completed in 2013, but we do not know if it has been completed. We can all be certain that the Marine Corps, their consultants, contractors and regulators were all certain that the facility that was going to be built in 1999 would perform as planned. It did not. Finally, one of our Members learned in the past, from speaking with an official from the Gregory Canyon developer, that their proposed liner manufacturer was the same “expert” firm that provided the failed Pulgas Canyon liner.

It may be possible to reasonably argue over whether or not any one of the points we’ve made in this and prior communications, or that any of the dozens of other organizations that oppose this landfill location in Gregory Canyon have made justify, on their own, a denial of the Corps of Engineers permit. However, it seems to us, that under the mandate of assessing the cumulative impacts of the overall project, it is simply not reasonable to approve this permit application or the overall Gregory Canyon Landfill project.

We strongly recommend that the permit application be denied.

Bradley Smith
Vice Chairman
Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group

October 15, 2015

bms0345@gmail.com

(760) 742-3458