

## 3.12 Public Services and Utilities

This section evaluates the public services and utilities in the SCAG region that may be affected by the 2008 RTP. The potential impacts on the public resources including police protection services, fire protection services, school facilities, and solid waste removal are identified. The chapter also identifies mitigation measures for the impacts and evaluates the residual effects.

### Environmental Setting

The environmental setting describes the public services and utilities that could be affected by the 2008 RTP. The environmental setting addresses police protection services, fire protection services, education facilities, and solid waste disposal in the region.

### Police Protection Services

Law enforcement within the SCAG region takes into account a variety of federal, state, county, city, and other local law enforcement agencies. Primary law enforcement is at the community level, with City Police and Sheriff's Departments providing this service. Additionally, there are more specialized law enforcement agencies that assist in law enforcement at the community or resource level in the SCAG region. These specialized agencies include, but are not limited to State Highway Patrol, School Police, Airport and Harbor Police, Transit Police, Tribal Police, Park Rangers (Federal, State, County, and City), and a wide variety of Federal Agencies (FBI, ATF, etc.). Each agency has their own responsibilities, some of which may overlap with other law enforcement agencies. State Park Rangers may call upon Sheriff's Deputies for assistance. Transit Police might call upon City Police to aid them. In general law enforcement agencies provide first response to all emergencies, perform preliminary investigations, and provide basic patrol services in their service area. **Table 3.12-1** shows the breakdown of law enforcement agencies at the county and city level. County service is for both unincorporated areas and cities that contract with the county for law enforcement services.

### Fire Protection Services

Fire Protection within the SCAG region includes a variety of federal, state, county, city, and other local fire protection agencies. As with police services, primary fire protection services occur at the community level, with city and county fire departments and fire protection districts providing this service. Also serving as fire protection services are a variety of volunteer fire companies. There are fire protection agencies that also provide fire protection services within state and federal lands. These agencies include, but are not limited to, federal fire agencies (Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, National Forest Service, Department of Defense, etc.), state forestry department, tribal fire departments, airport and harbor fire departments, and in some instances business sponsored fire departments (i.e. refineries, etc.). Each agency provides fire services within their own area of responsibilities, but they can call upon other agencies for fire support through mutual aid agreements. Generally, fire departments take proactive and

**TABLE 3.12-1  
 POLICE SERVICE PROVIDERS FOR JURISDICTIONS WITHIN SCAG COUNTIES <sup>(3)</sup>**

County	Jurisdictions Served By	
	County Sheriff's Department <sup>(1)</sup>	City Police Department <sup>(2)</sup>
Imperial	1	7
Los Angeles	41	48
Orange	13	22
Riverside	12	13
San Bernardino	15	10
Ventura	6	5

**SOURCES:**

Imperial County Sheriff's Department – Personal Contact, August 28, 2007  
 Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from  
[http://www.lasd.org/lasd\\_services/contract\\_law/contract\\_cities.html](http://www.lasd.org/lasd_services/contract_law/contract_cities.html)

Orange County Sheriff's Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from  
<http://www.ocSheriff's Department.org/>

Riverside County Sheriff's Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from  
<http://www.riversidesheriff.org/department/city-com.htm>

San Bernardino Sheriff's Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from  
<http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/sheriff/patrol/Patrol.asp>

Ventura County Sheriff's Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from  
[http://www.vcSheriff's Department.org/patrol\\_services/index.html](http://www.vcSheriff's Department.org/patrol_services/index.html)

**NOTES:**

1. Includes Cities and Unincorporated County Areas served by County Sheriff's Departments.
2. Includes Cities that contract with other Cities for Police Services (i.e., Yorba Linda with Brea, Santa Fe Springs with Whittier, etc.).
3. Does not include specialty police agencies such as School Districts, Airports, Ports, etc.

preventative measures to provide fire suppression and emergency response services for all private, institutional, and public facilities within their area of responsibility. **Table 3.12-2** shows the breakdown of fire prevention agencies at the county and city levels. County service is for both unincorporated areas, cities that contract with the county for fire protection service, and independent fire protection districts.

## Educational Facilities

There are approximately 3.2 million students enrolled in schools in the SCAG region, ranging from kindergarten to twelfth grade region, with approximately 150,000 teachers. **Table 3.12-3** lists the public school student and teacher totals by county. **Table 3.12-4** shows the number of school districts along with both public and private schools in the SCAG region by county.

## Solid Waste Disposal and Transfer Facilities

Over the past ten years, disposal tonnage has decreased significantly in the SCAG region as the emphasis on recycling to meet the requirements of AB 939 has served to divert tonnage from landfills and conserve landfill capacity. **Table 3.12-5** shows data from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) regarding the number of tons disposed in 2005 (the most recent year for which information is available), for each county in the SCAG region.

**TABLE 3.12-2  
FIRE PROTECTION SERVICE PROVIDERS FOR JURISDICTIONS WITHIN SCAG COUNTIES <sup>(1)</sup>**

County	Jurisdictions Served By		
	County Fire Department <sup>(2)</sup>	City Fire Departments	Fire Protection Districts or Other Independent Fire Agencies
Imperial	2	6	4
Los Angeles	59	30	1 <sup>(5)</sup>
Orange	23	10	1 <sup>(5)</sup>
Riverside	18	8	5
San Bernardino <sup>(3)</sup>	7	13	15 <sup>(4)</sup>
Ventura	7	4	- -

## SOURCES:

Imperial County Fire Department – County Fire Chief Fred Nippins – October 15, 2007

<http://www.imperialcounty.net/EmergencyPlans/MultiHazardMitigationPlan.pdf> September 18, 2007

Los Angeles County Fire Department, Retrieved August 28, 2007 from <http://www.fire.lacounty.gov/SpecialOps/SpecOps911Dispatch.asp>

Orange County Fire Authority, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from <http://www.ocfa.org/ocfamain.asp?pgn1=4>

Riverside County Fire Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from <http://www.rvcfire.org/opencms/ContractCities/>

San Bernardino Fire Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from <http://sbcfire.org/>

Ventura County Fire Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from

[http://www.vcFire Department.org/patrol\\_services/index.html](http://www.vcFire Department.org/patrol_services/index.html)

California Fire Departments website, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from <http://www.firedepartments.net/California/CA.html>

## Notes:

1. Numbers do not include various Federal, State, and specialty fire departments, such as Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Department of Defense, California Forestry Department (wild lands), private or public airport fire departments, business fire departments (i.e., refineries, Indian Tribal lands, etc.) that might aid county, city, and independent fire departments through mutual aid agreements, and visa versa.
2. Includes cities and unincorporated county areas served by county fire departments/authority.
3. Some districts service City and adjoining unincorporated areas.
4. Five Cities (Apple Valley, Barstow, Chino, Chino Hills, 29 Palms) served by independent fire protection districts.
5. City of La Habra served by LA County Fire Department.

**TABLE 3.12-3  
KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE 12 ENROLLMENT AND TEACHERS IN THE  
SCAG REGION FOR THE 2006-2007 SCHOOL YEAR**

County	Enrollment K-12	Teachers
Imperial	36,293	1,765
Los Angeles	1,673,246	79,702
Orange	503,955	22,923
Riverside	413,059	18,938
San Bernardino	427,583	19,349
Ventura	142,488	6,720
SCAG Region	3,196,624	149,397
California	6,286,952	308,790

SOURCE: California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. (2007, May 14). Enrollment in California public schools by county 2006-2007 [Data Query] and Number of teachers in California public schools by ethnicity by county 2006-07 [Data Query]. Retrieved June 19, 2007 from the California Department of Education Web site, <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>.



**TABLE 3.12-4  
 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN THE SCAG REGION**

County	Public Schools				Private Schools			
	K-12		Community College		UC System	Cal State System	K-12	College <sup>(1)</sup>
	Districts	Schools	Districts	Schools				
Imperial	16	77	1	1	--	--	9	--
Los Angeles	80	2,215	13	22	1	5	1,040	41
Orange	28	709	4	9	1	1	296	9
Riverside	23	530	4	4	1	--	149	2
San Bernardino	33	614	5	6	--	1	176	2
Ventura	20	241	1	3	--	1	85	3
Total	200	4,386	28	45	3	8	1,755	57

NOTES:

Imperial County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from <http://www.icoe.k12.ca.us/ICOE/>  
 Los Angeles County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from <http://www.lacoe.edu/>  
 Orange County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from [http://www.ocde.k12.ca.us/school\\_districts.asp](http://www.ocde.k12.ca.us/school_districts.asp)  
 Riverside County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from <http://www.rcoe.k12.ca.us/links3.html> San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from <http://www.sbcss.k12.ca.us/distSite.php>  
 Ventura County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from [http://www.vcss.k12.ca.us/Default.aspx?tabid=883&http://www.calstate.edu/search\\_find/campus.shtml](http://www.vcss.k12.ca.us/Default.aspx?tabid=883&http://www.calstate.edu/search_find/campus.shtml) 29 August 2007  
 The California State University website. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/campuses/welcome.html>  
 California Department of Education, School Directory. Retrieved August 30, 2007 from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/sd/>

1. Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Retrieved August 30, 2007 from <http://www.wascsenior.org/wasc/>

**TABLE 3.12-5  
 SOLID WASTE DISPOSED OF IN THE SCAG REGION – CY 2005**

County	Total Tonnage
Imperial	271,978
Los Angeles	9,852,405
Orange	5,202,149
Riverside	3,741,036
San Bernardino	1,919,998
Ventura	1,281,287
SCAG Region	22,268,862
California	42,158,298

SOURCE: California Integrated Waste Management Board Landfill Tonnage Reports. Retrieved August 28, 2007 from: <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Landfills/Tonnages/>

In viewing facilities on a county-by-county basis, it is important to note that landfills in one county may import waste generated elsewhere. Currently, Orange County offers capacity to out-of-county waste at a “tipping fee” low enough to attract waste from Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties. In Riverside County, the El Sobrante Landfill is licensed to accept up to 10,000 tons of waste per day from Riverside, Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, and San Bernardino counties. In Ventura County, 25 percent of the waste accepted by the Simi Valley Landfill & Recycling Center comes from other counties. **Map 3.12-1** illustrates the location of landfills in the region and **Table 3.12-6** provides detailed information on permitted active or planned solid waste landfills in the SCAG region.

**TABLE 3.12-6  
PERMITTED ACTIVE SOLID WASTE LANDFILLS IN THE SCAG REGION**

Name	County	Closure date	Daily Disposal (tons/day)	Maximum Capacity (cu yds)	Remaining Capacity (cu yds)
Allied Imperial Landfill	Imperial	1/1/2013	1,135	4,324,200	2,105,500
Calexico Solid Waste Site	Imperial	1/1/2022	150	2,064,598	1,530,950
Holtville Solid Waste Site	Imperial	4/1/2007	20	654,800	17,006
Hot Spa Solid Waste Site	Imperial	4/1/1936	10	516,266	57,497
Imperial Solid Waste Site	Imperial	9/1/2015	207	1,936,000	183,871
Monofill Facility	Imperial	3/1/2012	750	1,729,800	1,314,800
Niland Solid Waste Site	Imperial	4/1/2020	55	131,000	44,053
Picacho Cut And Fill Site	Imperial	1/1/2000	15	645,333	77,021
Salton City Solid Waste Site	Imperial	9/1/2011	50	2,581,000	9,078
Antelope Valley Public Landfill I	Los Angeles	7/1/1999	1,400	6,480,000	2,978,143
Antelope Valley Public Landfill II	Los Angeles	1/1/2008	1,800	8,206,000	8,206,000
Burbank Landfill Site No. 3	Los Angeles	1/1/2053	240	5,933,365	5,107,465
Calabasas Sanitary Landfill	Los Angeles	1/1/2028	3,500	69,700,000	16,900,400
Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill	Los Angeles	11/24/2019	6,000	63,900,000	35,800,000
Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center	Los Angeles	8/2/2012	1,700	26,665,000	19,088,739
Pebble Beach (Avalon) Disposal Site	Los Angeles	1/1/2033	49	143,142	104,100
Puente Hills Landfill	Los Angeles	10/31/2013	13,200	106,400,000	49,348,500
San Clemente Island Landfill	Los Angeles	1/1/2032	10	235,459	209,816
Savage Canyon Landfill	Los Angeles	1/1/2025	350	8,119,412	7,419,580
Scholl Canyon Sanitary Landfill	Los Angeles	1/1/2019	3,400	69,200,000	10,804,900
Sunshine Canyon City Landfill Unit 2	Los Angeles	Unknown	5,500	13,441,300	13,441,300
Sunshine Canyon SLF County Extension	Los Angeles	1/31/2013	6,600	37,315,352	17,015,625
Frank R. Bowerman Sanitary LF	Orange County	12/31/2022	8,500	127,000,000	59,411,872
Olinda Alpha Sanitary Landfill	Orange County	12/31/2013	8,000	74,900,000	38,587,383
Prima Deshecha Sanitary Landfill	Orange County	12/31/2067	4,000	172,900,000	87,384,799
Badlands Sanitary Landfill	Riverside County	1/1/2016	4,000	30,386,332	21,866,092
Blythe Sanitary Landfill	Riverside County	5/31/2034	400	4,633,000	2,289,139
Desert Center Landfill	Riverside County	1/1/2011	60	117,032	23,246
El Sobrante Landfill	Riverside County	1/1/2030	10,000	184,930,000	158,857,914
Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill	Riverside County	1/1/2023	3,000	34,292,000	20,908,171
Mecca Landfill II	Riverside County	1/1/2007	400	372,480	34,786
Oasis Sanitary Landfill	Riverside County	Unknown	400	870,000	75,727
Barstow Sanitary Landfill	San Bernardino County	5/1/2012	750	3,584,500	924,401
California Street Landfill	San Bernardino County	1/1/2031	829	10,000,000	6,800,000

**TABLE 3.12-6 (continued)**  
**PERMITTED ACTIVE SOLID WASTE LANDFILLS IN THE SCAG REGION**

Name	County	Closure date	Daily Disposal (tons/day)	Maximum Capacity (cu yds)	Remaining Capacity (cu yds)
Colton Sanitary Landfill	San Bernardino County	1/1/2006	31,000	13,297,000	610,000
Fort Irwin Sanitary Landfill	San Bernardino County	1/1/2045	100	19,000,000	18,935,202
Landers Sanitary Landfill	San Bernardino County	1/1/2013	1,200	3,080,000	1,300,000
Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill <sup>(1)</sup>	San Bernardino County	4/1/2033	7,500	62,000,000	71,500,000
Mitsubishi Cement Plant Cushenbury L.F.	San Bernardino County	1/1/2034	40	520,400	227,000
San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill	San Bernardino County	5/1/2016	1,000	20,400,000	9,491,163
USMC - 29 Palms Disposal Facility	San Bernardino County	1/1/2076	100	10,945,000	10,821,000
Victorville Sanitary Landfill	San Bernardino County	10/1/2047	3,000	83,200,000	82,200,000
Simi Valley Landfill & Recycling Center	Ventura County	12/1/2033	3,000	43,500,000	23,201,173
Toland Road Landfill	Ventura County	5/3/2027	1,500	30,000,000	19,199,130
			Total	1,360,249,771	826,412,542

SOURCE: California Integrated Waste Management Board. Solid waste information system. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/swis/Search.asp>.

1) Values for Maximum Capacity and Remaining Capacity are what are shown on web site. They may have been transposed.

## Waste Diversion and Recycling

Since the enactment of AB 939 in 1989, local governments have implemented recycling programs on a widespread basis, making efforts to meet the 25 percent and 50 percent diversion mandates of AB 939. Statewide, the CWIMB reports that diversion increased from 10 percent in 1989 to 42 percent in 2000 and to 48 percent in 2002.

**Table 3.12-7** shows the progress of local jurisdictions meeting AB 939 diversion requirements. The table shows the number of jurisdictions with diversion rates over 50 percent, the number with diversion rates between 25 percent and 50 percent, and the number with diversion rates below 25 percent. These diversion rate estimates, from the CIWMB, are based on the State-approved formula which utilizes the number of tons reported disposed and information regarding increases in population, employment and/or taxable retail sales.

**TABLE 3.12-7  
DIVERSION RATE SUMMARY**

County	Diversion Rate Range (Percentage)	Year/Number of Jurisdictions Reporting			
		2002	2003	2004	2005
<b>Imperial</b>	0-24	3	1	2 <sup>(1)</sup>	2
	25-49	3	4	4	4
	50-	1	1	2	2
	Not Reporting	1	2	0	0
	Preliminary <sup>(2)</sup>	0	0	0	8
<b>Los Angeles</b>	0-24	2	3	0	5
	25-49	37	26	18	39
	50-	43	38	49	30
	Not Reporting	7	9	9	0
	Preliminary <sup>(2)</sup>	3	9	8	74 <sup>(3)</sup>
<b>Orange</b>	0-24	1	2	1	0
	25-49	11	15	14	19
	50-	19	16	20	16
	Not Reporting	1	0	0	0
	Preliminary <sup>(2)</sup>	0	2	2	35
<b>Riverside</b>	0-24	0	1	2	2
	25-49	7	8	7	15
	50-	16	16	16	8
	Net Reporting	2	0	0	0
	Preliminary <sup>(2)</sup>	0	2	2	25
<b>San Bernardino</b>	0-24	0	0	2	1
	25-49	18	18	13	13
	50-	6	6	10	11
	Not Reporting	1	1	1	0
	Preliminary <sup>(2)</sup>	0	6	8	25
<b>Ventura</b>	0-24	0	0	0	0
	25-49	3	4	4	7
	50-	7	7	7	4
	Not Reporting	1	0	0	0
	Preliminary <sup>(2)</sup>	0	5	5	11

SOURCE: California Integrated Waste Management Board, Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report. Retrieved on August 30, 2007 from <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/mars/jurdrsta.asp>

Notes:

- 1) Holtville had a Division Rate of -2 Percent and Westmorland had a Division Rate of -12 Percent.
- 2) Preliminary data is subject to change during the Board review process or when a jurisdiction submits updated information.
- 3) The following cities are part of the Los Angeles Area Integrated Waste Management Authority Regional Agency: Artesia, Beverly Hills, Duarte, Gardena, Hidden Hills, Los Angeles, Lynwood, Manhattan Beach, Pomona, Rancho Palos Verdes, Redondo Beach, Rosemead, Sierra Madre, South Gate, and Torrance and are included in that agency's diversion rate.



## Urban Transportation Features

Elements of the transportation infrastructure, including roadways, freeways, bridges, and railroads, among others, are a large component of the urban environment and affect public services and utilities. A discussion of urban transportation features is included below.

### Freeways, Highways, and Roadways

On public roadways, there is a constant need for emergency services including police, fire, and paramedic services. Safety and a constant flow of traffic are maintained by the aforementioned public services on all freeways, highways, and roadways in the SCAG region and help facilitate efficient emergency response. In addition, the major ports, airports and shipping centers described below all require police, fire and emergency services to operate efficiently.

### Rail

Rail operations in the SCAG region can be broken down into two categories, passenger or freight. Passenger operations include Amtrak, Metrolink and Los Angeles County Metropolitan Agency (Metro) operated light and heavy rail lines.

Freight service generally includes those operated by BNSF, formally known as Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway and Union Pacific Railroad (UP). Railyard facilities within the region are predominately located within industrial areas including the Port of Los Angeles, the Port of Long Beach, East Los Angeles, Hobart, City of Industry (Los Angeles County), and West Colton. Additional freight facilities are also located in less densely populated areas such as Barstow and Yermo (San Bernardino County)

### Airports

The SCAG region includes numerous airports serving both commercial and private airplane flights. Airports with both passenger and cargo capability in the region include: Imperial County Airport (IPL) in Imperial County; Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), Bob Hope Airport (BUR), Long Beach Airport (LGB), and Palmdale Regional Airport (PMD) in Los Angeles County; John Wayne Airport (SNA) in Orange County; Ontario International Airport (ONT) in San Bernardino County; Palm Springs International Airport (PSP) in Riverside County; and Oxnard Airport (OXR) in Ventura County. San Bernardino International Airport (SBD) and Southern California Logistics Airport (VCV) in San Bernardino County and March Inland Port (RIV) in Riverside County operate as cargo only airports.

### Ports

The SCAG region includes three primary ports: the Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach and Hueneme. These ports are multi-faceted facilities, handling container ships, non-containerized bulk cargo ships, and tanker ships. Combined these ports handle approximately 40 percent of the volume imported into the country and approximately 24 percent of the nation's exports, and one out of every seven jobs in Southern California depends on this trade. As the only deep water port

between Los Angeles and San Francisco, the Port of Hueneme in Ventura County is a major shipping point for automobiles, fresh fruit and produce. Approximately \$7 billion in cargo traverses through the Port of Hueneme annually.

## Regulatory Setting

The regulatory setting describes the federal, state, and local agencies that have jurisdiction over public services and utilities. The regulations pertinent to public services and utilities that each of these agencies enforce are also described.

### Federal Agencies and Regulations

40 CFR, Part 258 Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) establishes minimum location standards for siting municipal solid waste landfills. Because California laws and regulations governing the approval of solid waste landfills meet the requirements of Subtitle D, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has delegated the enforcement responsibility to the State of California. California laws and regulations governing these facilities are summarized below.

### California Integrated Waste Management Act

As many of the landfills in the state are approaching capacity and the siting of new landfills becomes increasingly difficult, the need for source reduction, recycling, and composting has become readily apparent. In response to this increasing solid waste problem, in September 1989 the state Assembly passed Assembly Bill (AB) 939, known as the California Integrated Waste Management Act. The Act requires every City and County in the state to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) with its Solid Waste Management Plan that identifies how each jurisdiction will meet the mandatory state waste diversion goals of 25 percent by the year 1995 and 50 percent by the year 2000. Senate Bill 2202 mandates that jurisdictions continue 50 percent diversion on and after January 1, 2000. The purpose of AB 939 is to facilitate the reduction, recycling, and re-use of solid waste to the greatest extent possible. Noncompliance with the goals and timelines set forth within AB 939 can be severe, since the bill imposes fines of up to \$10,000 per day on cities and counties not meeting these recycling and planning goals.<sup>1</sup>

### California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB)

The CIWMB has numerous responsibilities in implementing the federal and state regulations summarized above. The CIWMB is the state agency responsible for permitting, enforcing and monitoring solid waste landfills, transfer stations, material recovery facilities (MRFs), and composting facilities within California. Permitted facilities are issued Solid Waste Facility Permits (SWFPs) by the CIWMB. The CIWMB also certifies and appoints Local Enforcement Agencies (LEAs), county or city agencies which monitor and enforce compliance with the provisions of SWFPs. The CIWMB is also responsible for monitoring implementation of AB 939 by the cities

---

<sup>1</sup> California Integrated Waste Management Board, "California Waste Stream Profiles: Jurisdictions," Retrieved December 14, 2007 from <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/profiles/juris/>.

and counties. In addition to these responsibilities, CIWMB also manages the Recycled-Content Materials Marketing Program to increase the understanding of and commitment to using specific recycled-content products in road applications, public works projects and landscaping. These products include recycled aggregate, tire-derived aggregate (TDA), rubberized asphalt concrete (RAC), and organic materials.

As discussed above AB 939 requires that each County in the state of California prepare a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). The CIWMP is a countywide planning document that describes the programs to be implemented in unincorporated and incorporated areas of the county that will effectively manage solid waste, and promote and implement the hierarchy of the Integrated Waste Management Act. The CIWMPs consists of a Summary Plan (SP), a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), a Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE), a Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE), and a Countywide Siting Element (CSE).<sup>2</sup>

### **Summary Plan (SP)**

A Summary Plan is a solid waste planning document required by Public Resources Code Section 41751, in which counties or regional agencies provide an overview of significant waste management problems faced by the jurisdiction, along with specific steps to be taken, independently and in concert with cities within their boundaries.

### **Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE)**

The SRRE consists of the following components: waste characterization, source reduction, recycling, composting, solid waste facility capacity, education and public information, funding, special waste and integration. Each city and county is required to prepare, adopt, and submit to the Board an SRRE, which includes a program for management of solid waste generated within the respective local jurisdiction. The SRREs must include an implementation schedule for the proposed implementation of source reduction, recycling, and composting programs. In addition, the plan identifies the amount of landfill and transformation capacity that will be needed for solid waste which cannot be reduced, recycled, or composted.<sup>3</sup>

### **Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)**

Each city and county is required to prepare, adopt and submit to the Board, a HHWE which identifies a program for the safe collection, recycling, treatment, and disposal of hazardous wastes that are generated by households. The HHWE specifies how household hazardous wastes generated by households within the jurisdiction must be collected, treated, and disposed. An adequate HHWE contains the following components: Evaluation of Alternatives, program

---

<sup>2</sup> California Integrated Waste Management Board, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Enforcement, Retrieved November 8, 2007 from <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LgLibrary/Policy/CIWMPEnforce/Default.htm#Table>

<sup>3</sup> CIWMP Enforcement Part I: Plan Adequacy. As approved by the Board on November 17, 1993 <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LgLibrary/Policy/CIWMPEnforce/Part1/SRREAdg.htm>, and Title 14, Chapter 9, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR): Articles 6.1, 6.2, and 7.0) Statutes: PRC sections 41000-41460.

selection, funding, implementation schedule and education and public information.<sup>4</sup>

## **Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE)**

Each city and county is required to prepare, adopt and submit to the Board, an NDFE which includes a description of new facilities and expansion of existing facilities, and all solid waste facility expansions (except disposal and transformation facilities) that recover for reuse at least five percent of the total volume. The NDFE are to be consistent with the implementation of a local jurisdiction's SRRE. Each jurisdiction must also describe transfer stations located within and outside of the jurisdiction, which recover less than five percent of the material received.<sup>5</sup>

## **Countywide Siting Element (CSE)**

Counties are required to prepare a CSE that describes areas that may be used for developing new disposal facilities. The element also provides an estimate of the total permitted disposal capacity needed for a 15-year period if counties determine that their existing disposal capacity will be exhausted within 15 years or if additional capacity is desired (PRC Sections 41700-41721.5).

## **Local Agencies and Regulations**

Each county in the SCAG region has created a CIWMP in accordance with AB 939. Below is a brief description of the recent updates to these plans by county.

### ***Imperial County***

Imperial County's Integrated Waste Management Plan was comprehensively revised in 1998 and 1999. In 2003, the Nondisposal Facility element was amended to emphasize the development of medium and large volume transfer and processing stations at existing landfills to reduce operational costs. These facilities will be operated by the County and are expected to be located at the Brawley, Imperial, Holtville, and Picacho landfills. The Summary Plan identifies goals and policies to improve source reduction and recycling and includes specific programs to reduce the volume of tires and the amount of construction and demolition debris disposed of at county landfills. The plan will be assessed regularly and updated when necessary to reflect new goals and policies or proposed development of new facilities.

### ***Los Angeles County***

Los Angeles County is revising its Summary Plan and Siting Element to reflect changes in the County's policies and goals, including promotion of conversion technologies, formation of the Los Angeles Regional Agency, update of countywide jurisdiction assistance programs to meet diversion goals, expansion of existing disposal facilities, and development of additional non-disposal facilities for the use of out-of-county disposal facilities. Plan revisions are expected to be

---

<sup>4</sup> Title 14, Chapter 9, of the CCR: Article 6.3 and 7.0) Statutes: PRC Sections 41500-41510.

<sup>5</sup> P R C, Sections 41730-41736.

completed by 2008.

The County's 2004 Annual Report details the revision process, assesses remaining permitted capacity for the mandated 15-year planning horizon, and outlines five disposal capacity scenarios, two of which project sufficient capacity to meet future demand through the use of conversion technologies and out-of-county disposal facilities. The Annual Report outlines county solid waste management challenges, including a shortage of processing capacity in the county, insufficient markets for recovered materials, necessary updates to the Disposal Reporting System to incorporate all recommendations made by the legislature, and steps to promote and develop conversion technologies.

### ***Orange County***

Orange County completed the first review of its CIWMP in April 2003. It found sufficient disposal capacity for the 15-year planning horizon, but identified other challenges, including the lack of an operational materials recovery facility in the southern portion of the county, changes in records management to comply with the Disposal Recovery System, and determination of accurate base year data.

In addition to the CIWMP, Orange County's Integrated Waste Management Department has initiated a long-term strategic planning project—the Regional Landfill Options for Orange County (RELOOC)—which assesses the solid waste disposal needs of Orange County for the next 40 years. RELOOC's 2005 Strategic Plan Update summarizes progress to maximize capacity at existing landfills, assess alternative technologies and potential out-of-county disposal sites, and expand the Frank R. Bowerman and Olinda Alpha landfills.

### ***Riverside County***

Riverside County's CIWMP was approved in 1996, and its 2004 Annual Report found the original plan remained applicable, so no comprehensive update is planned. The Non-disposal Facility element was updated in 2006 to include amendments to one transfer and processing facility and one recycling facility. It also includes plans for two proposed composting facilities and one transfer station/materials recovery facility, pending permit approval. The 2004 Annual Report observed that by utilizing current programs and facilities, Riverside County has 19 years of disposal capacity remaining.

### ***San Bernardino County***

San Bernardino County revised its CIWMP in 2002; its five-year review is scheduled in 2007. The 2002 report reflects updates to the county's goals and policies, changes to its disposal facilities, and assesses disposal capacity for the mandated 15-year planning horizon. Updated policies include programs to help jurisdictions reach diversion goals, such as additional recycling and composting programs and the development of regional material recovery facilities. Facilities changes include expansion of the California Street Landfill by the City of Redlands, and the planned expansions of both the Barstow and Victorville landfills. The feasibility of Landers and San Timoteo landfill expansions is being assessed. The 2002 review found sufficient disposal

capacity for the next 15 years, and if the planned landfill expansions are completed, the county will have nearly 50 years of disposal capacity.

### ***Ventura County***

Ventura County's CIWMP was approved in 1995 and 1996 and updated in 2000. In 2000, the county developed two disposal capacity scenarios for the 15-year time horizon: one involved expansion of the Simi Valley Landfill; the other planned for closure of the landfill and the resulting capacity shortfall. Expansion was approved in 2003, providing sufficient disposal capacity. The county submitted its most recent Five-Year Annual Review report in November 2005, which addressed future needs, plans, and policies. The County had approximately 22 years of disposal capacity remaining when the report was issued.

### **Cities**

Cities are responsible for working with each county's Local Task Force to create SRREs and HHWEs for inclusion in the county plan. The SRRE details how the jurisdiction will comply with the diversion rates mandated by the State, and the HHWE details how the jurisdiction will handle household hazardous waste. These elements are reviewed every five years and updated when necessary.

### **Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB)**

New or expanded landfills must submit Reports of Waste Discharge to RWQCBs prior to landfill operations. In conjunction with the CIWMB approval of SWFPs, RWQCBs issue Waste Discharge Orders which regulate the liner, leachate control and removal, and groundwater monitoring systems at Class III landfills.

### **South Coast Air Quality Management District**

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) regulates emissions from landfills. Landfill owners/operators must obtain permits to construct and operate landfill flares, cogeneration facilities or other facilities used to combust landfill gas. Owner/operators also are subject to the provisions of SCAQMD Rule 1150.1 (Control of Gaseous Emissions from Landfills). This rule requires the submittal of a compliance plan for implementation of a landfill gas control system, periodic ambient monitoring of surface emissions, and the installation of probes to detect the lateral migration of landfill gas.

### **Methodology**

This section summarizes the methodology used to evaluate the expected impacts of implementation of the proposed Plan on existing public services and associated environmental effects.

### **Comparison with the No Project**

The analysis of public services includes a comparison between the expected future conditions

with the Plan and the expected future conditions if no Plan were adopted. This evaluation is not included in the determination of the significance of impacts (which is based on a comparison to existing conditions), however it provides a meaningful perspective on the effects of the 2008 RTP.

## **Determination of Significance**

The public services analysis evaluates utilities and public services that are most likely to be affected by the implementation of the projects, programs, and policies identified in the Plan. Impacts to public services were evaluated with SCAG data related to projected population, housing, and employment growth and available data on public services within the six-county region. The methodology for determining the significance of these impacts applies the significance criteria below to the expected future (2035) demand for public services and compares future demand with the Plan to the existing capacity for public services.

### **Significance Criteria**

A significant impact is defined as “a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment” (CEQA § 21068). The proposed Plan would have a significant impact if implementation would:

- Create a substantial need within the region for construction of additional public facilities, such as fire and police stations, schools or other public facilities; or
- Uncover and potentially sever underground utility lines; or
- Generate a substantial increase in the amount of solid waste that exceeds the region’s available landfills’ capacity to handle and dispose of the waste.

## **Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of the 2008 RTP will affect public school services and utilities. Expected significant cumulative impacts include demand for more police, fire, and emergency personnel and facilities.

Both short-term construction related impacts and long-term or permanent impacts from new facilities potentially would result from implementation of the proposed Plan. Below are descriptions of the types of direct impacts foreseeable from new transportation projects proposed in the 2008 RTP. Indirect, cumulative impacts from implementation of the proposed Plan, in combination with increases in growth and development, are also identified. It should be noted, however, that project specific impacts may vary and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be developed on a project-by-project basis.

All mitigation measures should be included in project-level analysis as appropriate. The project proponent or local jurisdiction shall be responsible for ensuring adherence to the mitigation measures prior to construction. For regionally significant projects SCAG shall be provided with documentation of compliance with mitigation measures through its Intergovernmental Review Process in which all regionally significant projects, plans, and programs must be consistent with

regional plans and policies.

**Impact 3.12-1: Construction and implementation of the 2008 RTP would affect the level of transportation-related public services facilities, such as police and fire/emergency personnel and associated stations or other public facilities in the SCAG region.**

Police services, fire protection, and emergency medical services within the SCAG region are provided by numerous agencies within multiple jurisdictions (see **Tables 3.12-1** and **3.12-2**). Depending upon the timing, location, and duration of construction activities, several of the proposed projects, including grade crossings, arterials, interchanges, and auxiliary lanes, could delay emergency vehicle response times or otherwise disrupt delivery of emergency services. By closing off one or more lanes of a roadway, emergency routes would be impaired. The closure of these lanes could potentially cause traffic delays and ultimately prevent access to calls for service. While these impacts would be brief in nature, they could be potentially significant. As part of project specific environmental review, the project implementation agency shall determine the degree of impact to emergency services.

Overall, project construction-related impacts to emergency vehicle response times and access could be reduced through adherence to road encroachment permits by the implementing agency. Traffic control plans should be prepared as part of the construction mitigation strategy to further reduce impacts on traffic and emergency response vehicles.

In addition, there is the potential need for increased police, fire, and medical services at the construction sites of 2008 RTP projects for security and safety purposes. However, construction sites are typically secured and have security onsite. The impact of the construction sites themselves on police, fire and emergency medical services is anticipated to be short-term in nature and less than significant. There are several types of projects included within the 2008 RTP that, upon completion, would require different levels of police, fire, and medical services. Projects involving new roadways are anticipated to require police, fire, and emergency medical services for safety purposes.

Transit-related projects would, in many cases, involve the construction of transit stations. These transit stations, upon completion, would require police, fire, and emergency medical services. In some cases, such as with Metro, the governing transit authority provides security. Additionally, the increased use of transit would involve an increased need for police, fire, and emergency medical services for protection and rescue services.

Rail projects, other than transit stations, are anticipated to require minimal amounts of additional fire, police, and emergency medical services for safety purposes.

The improvement of and the increased usage of non-motorized transportation methods, such as bicycle routes, are anticipated to require minimal amounts of additional police, fire, and emergency medical services. If restrooms or drinking fountains are incorporated into non-motorized transportation projects, these uses would require a minimal amount of police, fire, and emergency medical personnel for security and safety.

Throughout the SCAG region, public service and utility providers have historically accommodated increases in demand. For the most part, the 2008 RTP transportation projects would not generate a substantial, direct need for additional police, fire, and emergency medical services. Only new facilities, such as transit stations, could require potentially significant levels of police, fire, and medical services. Fire and medical services are anticipated to be sufficient in their local jurisdictions to handle the increase in demand generated by facilities like transit stations. Any new transit police staff or facility that would be deemed necessary (by the project level CEQA documentation) will need to be funded by the appropriate transit authority, if necessary.

Based on the demand for public service and utility for similar projects and on the current capacities of existing fire, police, and medical services, the total projected demand for each of these types of projects is not anticipated to be significant.

School facilities would not be directly affected by implementation of the 2008 RTP. The cumulative effect of the resulting population growth and distribution would affect schools. This will be discussed in the cumulative impact section of this chapter.

Before mitigation the direct demand for public services and utilities would be potentially significant.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

**MM-PS.1:** Project implementation agencies shall ensure that prior to construction all necessary local and state road and railroad encroachment permits are obtained. The project implementation agency shall also comply with all applicable conditions of approval. As deemed necessary by the governing jurisdiction, the road encroachment permits may require the contractor to prepare a traffic control plan in accordance with professional engineering standards prior to construction. Traffic control plans should include the following requirements:

- Identification of all roadway locations where special construction techniques (e.g., directional drilling or night construction) would be used to minimize impacts to traffic flow.
- Development of circulation and detour plans to minimize impacts to local street circulation. This may include the use of signing and flagging to guide vehicles through and/or around the construction zone.
- Scheduling of truck trips outside of peak morning and evening commute hours.
- Limiting of lane closures during peak hours to the extent possible.
- Usage of haul routes minimizing truck traffic on local roadways to the extent possible.
- Inclusion of detours for bicycles and pedestrians in all areas potentially affected by project construction.

- Installation of traffic control devices as specified in the California Department of Transportation Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones.
- Development and implementation of access plans for highly sensitive land uses such as police and fire stations, transit stations, hospitals, and schools. The access plans would be developed with the facility owner or administrator. To minimize disruption of emergency vehicle access, affected jurisdictions shall be asked to identify detours for emergency vehicles, which will then be posted by the contractor. Notify in advance the facility owner or operator of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities and the locations of detours and lane closures.
- Storage of construction materials only in designated areas.
- Coordination with local transit agencies for temporary relocation of routes or bus stops in work zones, as necessary.

#### **Significance after Mitigation**

The impact would be **less than significant** with mitigation.

---

#### **Impact 3.12-2: Construction necessary to implement the 2008 RTP may uncover and potentially sever underground utility lines (electric and natural gas).**

Any groundbreaking in the SCAG region has the potential to encounter underground utility lines and potentially break those lines. To accommodate the projected growth, numerous new developments would be built and existing development would be recycled into new uses. These building activities would uncover and potentially sever different types of underground utility lines. However, the project implementation agency is normally required to incorporate the locations of existing utility lines into the construction schedule prior to construction. Prior knowledge and avoidance during construction of existing utility lines would reduce this impact to less than significant.

#### ***Mitigation Measures***

**MM-PS.2:** Prior to construction, the project implementation agency shall identify the locations of existing utility lines. The contractor shall avoid all known utility lines during construction.

#### **Significance after Mitigation**

The impact would be **less than significant** after mitigation.

---

#### **Impact 3.12-3: Construction necessary to implement the 2008 RTP would affect the**

### **demand for solid waste services in the SCAG region.**

Several of the projects within the 2008 RTP have the potential to generate a significant amount of solid waste during construction, such as new transit lines, truck lanes, and HSRT projects through grading and excavation activities. Construction debris would be recycled or transported to the nearest landfill site and disposed of appropriately. Currently, several landfills in the SCAG region function at or below their permitted capacity. Therefore, the projects proposed under the 2008 RTP are not anticipated to generate a significant amount of solid waste during construction. Nevertheless, the amount of debris generated during project construction would need to be evaluated prior to construction on a project by project basis. The mitigation measures described below would help to reduce impacts.

Several projects within the 2008 RTP would involve the construction of roadways, rails, and facilities at various locations throughout the SCAG region. It is assumed that these projects, upon completion, will require additional public services and utilities to handle increased demand for solid waste services. These increases would need to be evaluated on a project by project basis.

In some cases, transit-related projects would involve the construction of transit stations. These transit stations would generate incremental amounts of solid waste. The increased use of transit methods of transportation, such as buses and trains, would involve a minimal increase in the demand for solid waste collection.

Rail projects, other than transit-related rail, are not anticipated to require additional solid waste service unless they involve the construction of additional railways or facilities.

The improvement of and increased usage of non-motorized transportation methods, like bike routes, are not anticipated to require additional levels of solid waste. If restrooms are incorporated into non-motorized transportation projects, these uses would also require minimal amounts of solid waste (for trash receptacles) services.

Although the SCAG region has existing capacity for solid waste and has several landfills that are scheduled to be open through the life of the plan, as shown previously in **Table 3.12-6**, there may be insufficient waste disposal capacity where the waste is being generated. As a result, solid waste may need to be shipped by truck or rail from urbanized areas to the remote disposal locations in Riverside and Imperial Counties, resulting in a significant impact.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

**MM-PS.3:** Projects identified in the 2008 RTP that require solid waste collection will coordinate with the local public works department to ensure that the existing public services and utilities would be able to handle the increase. If the current infrastructure servicing the project site is found to be inadequate, infrastructure improvements for the appropriate public service or utility shall be identified in each project's CEQA documentation.

**MM-PS.4:** Each of the proposed projects identified in the 2008 RTP shall comply with applicable regulations related to solid waste disposal.

**MM-PS.5:** The construction contractor shall work with the respective County's Recycling Coordinator to ensure that source reduction techniques and recycling measures are incorporated into project construction.

**MM-PS.6:** The amount of solid waste generated during construction will be estimated prior to construction, and appropriate disposal sites will be identified and utilized.

**MM-PS.7:** Project implementation agencies shall integrate green building measures into project design such as those identified in the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, energy Star Homes, Green Point Rated Homes, and the California Green Builder Program. These measures would include the following:

- Reuse and minimization of construction and demolition (C&D) debris and diversion of C&D waste from landfills to recycling facilities.
- The inclusion of a waste management plan that promotes maximum C&D diversion.
- Source reduction through (1) use of materials that are more durable and easier to repair and maintain, (2) design to generate less scrap material through dimensional planning, (3) increased recycled content, (4) use of reclaimed materials, and (5) use of structural materials in a dual role as finish material (e.g. stained concrete flooring, unfinished ceilings, etc.).
- Reuse of existing structure and shell in renovation projects.
- Design for deconstruction without compromising safety.
- Design for flexibility through the use of moveable walls, raised floors, modular furniture, moveable task lighting and other reusable building components.
- Development of indoor recycling program and space.

**MM-PS.8:** Project implementation agencies shall discourage the siting of new landfills unless all other waste reduction and prevention actions have been fully explored. If landfill siting or expansion is necessary, landfills should be sited with an adequate landfill-owned, undeveloped land buffer to minimize the potential adverse impacts of the landfill in neighboring communities.

**MM-PS.9:** Project implementation agencies shall discourage exporting of locally generated waste outside of the SCAG region. Disposal within the county where the waste originates shall be encouraged as much as possible. Green technologies for long-distance transport of waste (e.g., clean engines and clean locomotives or electric rail for waste-by-rail disposal systems) and consistency with SCAQMP and RTP policies

should be required.

**MM-PS.10:** Project implementation agencies shall adopt Zero Waste goals and practices and look for opportunities for voluntary actions to exceed the 50% waste diversion target.

**MM-PS.11:** Project implementation agencies shall build local markets for waste prevention, reduction, and recycling practices.

**MM-PS.12:** Project implementation agencies shall develop ordinances that promote waste prevention and recycling such as: requiring waste prevention and recycling efforts at all large events and venues; implementing recycled content procurement programs; and instituting ordinances to divert food waste away from landfills and toward food banks and composting facilities.

**MM-PS.13:** Project implementation agencies shall develop environmentally friendly alternative waste management strategies such as composting, recycling, and conversion technologies.

**MM-PS.14:** Project implementation agencies shall develop and site composting, recycling, and conversion technology facilities that are environmentally friendly and have minimum environmental and health impacts.

#### **Significance after Mitigation**

The impact would be **less than significant** after mitigation.

---

**Cumulative Impact 3.12-4: Urbanization in the SCAG region will increase substantially by 2035. The 2008 RTP, by increasing mobility and including land-use-transportation measures, influences the pattern of this urbanization. The 2008 RTP's influence on growth contributes to regional cumulatively considerable impacts to the response times of police and fire and emergency services in the SCAG region.**

By 2035, the SCAG region is anticipated to add an additional 5.14 million people and approximately 200,000 urbanized acres with the 2008 RTP. Under the 2008 RTP, freeway speeds are expected to decline by approximately two miles per hour. This change in freeway speeds would not be expected to have a significant impact on response times for emergency vehicles.

#### ***Mitigation Measures***

Less than significant. None required.

### Significance after Mitigation

The impact would not be cumulatively considerable and would be **less than significant**.

---

**Cumulative Impact 3.12-5: Urbanization in the SCAG region will increase substantially by 2035. The 2008 RTP, by increasing mobility and including land-use-transportation measures, influences the pattern of this urbanization. The 2008 RTP's influence on growth contributes to regional cumulatively considerable impacts to the staffing level of police and fire and emergency services in the SCAG region.**

The forecast 5.14 million new people in the region will require police, fire, and other emergency personnel, beyond current staffing levels. Cities and counties in the region set minimum response times for police and fire protection. Police and fire and emergency service needs will be determined on a project-level basis by individual police and fire service providers. The 2008 RTP projects that 200,000 acres of land uses including vacant land, open space and recreational lands, farmland, and water & floodways will be affected by Major Highway, Transit, and Freight Rail projects. This acreage equals approximately 300 square miles of area that will need to be serviced by police, fire, and other emergency personnel.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

**MM-PS.15:** The growth inducing potential of individual projects shall be carefully evaluated so that the full implications of the projects are understood. Individual environmental documents shall quantify indirect impacts (growth that could be facilitated or induced) on public services and utilities to the extent feasible. Lead and responsible agencies then will make any necessary adjustments to the applicable General Plan. Any such identified adjustment shall be communicated to SCAG.

**MM-PS.16:** The project implementation agency shall identify projects in the 2008 RTP that require police protection, fire service, and emergency medical service and shall coordinate with local fire and police departments to ensure that the existing public services would be able to handle the increase in demand for their services. If the current levels of services at the project site are found to be inadequate, infrastructure improvements and/or personnel requirements for the appropriate public service shall be identified in each project's CEQA documentation.

### Significance after Mitigation

The demand to hire and train new police, fire and emergency personnel would remain a significant impact.

---

**Cumulative Impact 3.12-6: Urbanization in the SCAG region will increase substantially by 2035. The 2008 RTP, by increasing mobility and by inclusion of land-use-transportation**

**measures, influences the pattern of this urbanization. The 2008 RTP's influence on urbanization patterns contributes to regional cumulatively considerable impacts to the number of school-age children and the demand for school facilities in different parts of the SCAG region.**

Population in the SCAG region is anticipated to increase by approximately 5.14 million people, regardless of the 2008 RTP. The population of school-aged children (5-17) is anticipated to increase by approximately 600,000. This growth will require that additional schools and classrooms be built to accommodate the new students. Additional teachers will also be required to accommodate the increase in students.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

**MM-PS.17:** Project implementation agencies shall undertake project specific review of the public utilities and services as part of project specific environmental review. For any identified impacts, project implementation agencies shall ensure that the appropriate school district has the school capacity, or is planning for the capacity, that the project will generate. Appropriate mitigation measures, such as new school construction or expansion, shall be identified. The project implementation agencies or local jurisdiction shall be responsible for ensuring adherence to the mitigation measures. SCAG shall be provided with documentation of compliance with any necessary mitigation measures.

### **Significance after Mitigation**

The region's cumulative demand for new schools and teachers would be a significant impact on public services.

---

**Cumulative Impact 3.12-7: Urbanization in the SCAG region will increase substantially by 2035. The 2008 RTP, by increasing mobility and including land-use-transportation measures, influences the pattern of this urbanization. The 2008 RTP's influence would create a cumulatively considerable impact to the demand for solid waste services in the SCAG region.**

The population of the SCAG region is forecast to increase by approximately 5.14 million people by 2035. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works estimates that the average resident in Los Angeles County disposes of 2.4 pounds of trash per day, considering an average diversion rate of 50 percent. Assuming a similar generation rate, residents in Los Angeles County would generate approximately 30 million pounds of waste per day in 2035.<sup>6</sup> The remaining counties in the SCAG region would generate approximately 24 million pounds of waste per day in 2035 for a regional total of approximately 54 million pounds per day, with half (27 pounds)

---

<sup>6</sup> Personal communication, Richard Ledesma, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, November 20, 2007. Includes both residential and non-residential generation.

requiring landfilling.<sup>7,8</sup> Non-residential land uses also generate waste, and generally at a higher rate than residential uses. Based on data from CIWMB, non-residential uses in the SCAG region would generate approximately 53 million pounds of waste per day in 2035, with approximately 26 million pounds per day requiring landfilling.<sup>9</sup>

The SCAG region has existing capacity for solid waste and has several landfills that are scheduled to be open through the life of the plan, as shown previously in **Table 3.12-6**. There is sufficient capacity for waste disposal in the region through 2035. However, there may be insufficient waste disposal capacity where the waste is being generated. Solid waste may need to be transported by truck or rail from urbanized areas to the remote disposal locations in Riverside and Imperial Counties.

Cumulative impacts of transporting 107 million pounds of waste per day to appropriate disposal areas would be significant.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

**MM-PS.18:** The California Integrated Waste Management Board shall continue to enforce solid waste diversion mandates that are enacted by the Legislature.

**MM-PS.19:** Local jurisdictions shall continue to adopt programs to comply with state solid waste diversion rate mandates and, where possible, shall encourage further recycling to exceed these rates.

**MM-PS.20:** Local jurisdictions shall implement or expand city or county-wide recycling and composting programs for residents and businesses. This could include extending the types of recycling services offered (e.g., to include food and green waste recycling) and providing public education and publicity about recycling services.

**MM-PS.21:** Project implementation agencies shall coordinate regional approaches and strategic siting of waste management facilities.

**MM-PS.22:** Project implementation agencies shall facilitate the creation of synergistic linkages between community businesses and the development of eco-industrial parks and materials exchange centers where one entity's waste stream becomes another entity's raw material by making priority funding available for projects that involve co-location of facilities.

**MM-PS.23:** Project implementation agencies shall prioritize siting of new solid waste management facilities including recycling, composting, and conversion technology facilities in conjunction with existing waste management or material recovery

---

<sup>7</sup> California Integrated Waste Management Board, California Waste Stream Profiles by County, Residential Disposal (Pounds per Resident per Day). Retrieved November 30, 2007 from <http://ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/County>.

<sup>8</sup> Assuming all jurisdictions meet the AB 939 diversion rate of 50 percent.

<sup>9</sup> California Integrated Waste Management Board, California Waste Stream Profiles by County, Non-Residential Disposal (Pounds per Employee per Day), Retrieved December 3, 2007 from <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/>.

facilities.

**MM-PS.24:** Project implementation agencies shall increase programs to educate the public and increase awareness of reuse, recycling, composting, and green building benefits and raise consumer education issues at the county and city level, as well as at local school districts and education facilities.

**MM-PS.25:** SCAG shall encourage projects to reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste.

**MM-PS.26:** SCAG shall encourage methane recovery in local landfills and wastewater treatment plants to generate electricity.

### **Significance after Mitigation**

While disposal capacity for the solid waste in 2035 has been identified, the cumulative impacts of collecting solid waste, transporting it to an available facility, and disposing of it would remain **significant**.

---

## **Comparison with the no Project**

In the No Project alternative, the population of the SCAG region grows by 5.14 million people, however no regional transportation investments would be made above the existing programmed projects. The population distribution could follow past trends, uninfluenced by additional transportation investments.

### **Direct Impacts**

Under the No Project Alternative, the need for public services and facilities for transportation projects would be less than under the Plan Alternative because fewer projects would be built. The potential that building the projects would disrupt or sever underground utility lines also would be less in the No Project Alternative than in the Plan Alternative because there are fewer transportation projects.

*The Plan impacts would be greater than the No Project impacts for Impacts 3.12-1, 3.12-2, and 3.12-3.*

## **Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulatively, the congestion that results because of a lack of additional transportation improvement projects and the population distribution would result in emergency vehicle response times that are worse in the No Project Alternative than under the Plan Alternative.

The cumulative need for additional emergency personnel, schools, and solid waste services to

accommodate the population would be the same in the No Project Alternative as in the Plan Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative new growth would be spread over about 655,000 acres of vacant, open space/recreational and agricultural lands compared to about 200,000 under the Plan. Thus greater extension of infrastructure would be needed under the no Project Alternative.

*The Plan Alternatives cumulative impacts would be less than the No Project Alternative's cumulative impacts for Cumulative Impact 3.12-4 and approximately the same for Cumulative Impacts 3.12-5 through 3.12-7.*

## Reference - Public Services and Utilities

Imperial County Fire Department, Retrieved September 17, 2007 from  
<http://www.imperialcounty.net/EmergencyPlans/MultiHazardMitigationPlan.pdf>

Los Angeles County Fire Department, Retrieved August 28, 2007 from  
<http://www.fire.lacounty.gov/SpecialOps/SpecOps911Dispatch.asp>

Orange County Fire Authority, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from  
<http://www.ocfa.org/ocfamain.asp?pgn1=4>

Riverside County Fire Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from  
<http://www.rvcfire.org/opencms/ContractCities/>

San Bernardino Fire Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from <http://sbcfire.org/>

Ventura County Fire Department, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from [http://www.vcFireDepartment.org/patrol\\_services/index.html](http://www.vcFireDepartment.org/patrol_services/index.html)

California Fire Departments website, Retrieved August 27, 2007 from  
<http://www.firedepartments.net/California/CA.html>

California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. (2007, May 14). Retrieved June 19, 2007 from the California Department of Education Web site,  
<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>.

Imperial County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from  
<http://www.icoe.k12.ca.us/ICOE/>

Los Angeles County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from <http://www.lacoe.edu/>

Orange County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from  
[http://www.ocde.k12.ca.us/school\\_districts.asp](http://www.ocde.k12.ca.us/school_districts.asp)

Riverside County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from  
<http://www.rcoe.k12.ca.us/links3.html>

San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from  
<http://www.sbcss.k12.ca.us/distSite.php>

Ventura County Office of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from  
<http://www.vcss.k12.ca.us/Default.aspx?tabid=883> and  
[http://www.calstate.edu/search\\_find/campus.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/search_find/campus.shtml)

The California State University website. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from  
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/campuses/welcome.html>

California Department of Education, School Directory. Retrieved August 30, 2007 from  
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/sd/>

Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Retrieved August 30, 2007 from  
<http://www.wascenior.org/wasc/>

California Integrated Waste Management Board Landfill Tonnage Reports. Retrieved  
August 28, 2007 from <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Landfills/Tonnages/>

California Integrated Waste Management Board, Countywide Integrated Waste Management  
Plan Enforcement, Retrieved November 8, 2007 from  
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LgLibrary/Policy/CIWMPEnforce/Default.htm#Table>

California Integrated Waste Management Board Enforcement Part I: Plan Adequacy. As  
approved by the Board on November 17, 1993  
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LgLibrary/Policy/CIWMPEnforce/Part1/SRREAdq.htm>

California Integrated Waste Management Board, Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide  
Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report. Retrieved on August 30, 2007 from  
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/mars/jurdrsta.asp>

California Integrated Waste Management Board. Solid waste information system. Retrieved  
August 29, 2007 from <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/swis/Search.asp>.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, California Waste Stream Profiles by County,  
Residential Disposal (Pounds per Resident per Day). Retrieved November 30, 2007 from  
<http://ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/County>.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, California Waste Stream Profiles by County,  
Non-Residential Disposal (Pounds per Employee per Day), Retrieved December 3, 2007  
from <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/>.

Southern California Association of Governments. (1994, May). Regional transportation plan and  
chapters of the regional comprehensive plan final environmental impact report (Vol. II, pp.  
5.6, 5.8). Los Angeles: Author.