

## 3.21 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

This section addresses the impacts of the Species Conservation Habitat (SCH) Project on stormwater and flood management and solid waste disposal. Impacts associated with increased power demand are addressed in Section 3.6, Energy Consumption. Water supplies for the SCH ponds are addressed in Section 3.11, Hydrology and Water Quality. The study area for utilities includes the SCH sites and landfills that accept nonhazardous materials in Imperial County and landfills that accept hazardous materials in Kings and Kern counties. Although non-hazardous solid waste from the SCH Project could potentially be disposed of in other counties, the analysis focuses on the capacity of Imperial County landfills. Using local facilities would minimize the distance solid waste would have to be transported, thus reducing impacts on other resources, such as air quality and transportation and traffic.

Table 3.21-1 summarizes the impacts of the six SCH Project alternatives on utilities and service systems compared to both the existing conditions and the No Action Alternative.

Table 3.21-1 Summary of Impacts on Utilities and Service Systems								
Impact	Basis of Comparison	Project Alternative						Mitigation Measures
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
Impact UT-1: Dust suppression water would be required, but would not exceed supplies.	Existing Condition	L	L	L	L	L	L	None required
	No Action	L	L	L	L	L	L	None required
Impact UT-2: Construction and operations would generate solid waste requiring disposal in landfills.	Existing Condition	L	L	L	L	L	L	None required
	No Action	L	L	L	L	L	L	None required
Note: O = No Impact L = Less-than-Significant Impact S = Significant Impact, but Mitigable to Less than Significant U = Significant Unavoidable Impact B = Beneficial Impact								

### 3.21.1 Regulatory Requirements

#### 3.21.1.1 Stormwater and Flood Management

##### *Federal Clean Water Act of 1977*

The Clean Water Act is the primary Federal law that protects our nation's waters, including lakes, rivers, aquifers, and coastal areas. Clean Water Act section 401 requires that any applicant for a Federal permit to conduct any activity, including the construction or operation of a facility, which may result in the discharge of any pollutant, must obtain certification from the state. Clean Water Act section 402 established the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System to regulate the discharge of pollutants from point sources. Clean Water Act section 404 established a permit program to regulate the discharge of dredged material into waters of the United States.

1 ***Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act of 1969***

2 The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code section 13000 et seq.) provides  
3 for aesthetic values, fish and wildlife preservation, water reclamation, and comprehensive planning and  
4 regulation to attain the highest “reasonable” water quality in consideration of conflicting demands.  
5 California's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, which became California Water Code Division 7  
6 (Water Quality), establishes the responsibilities and authorities of the nine Regional Water Quality  
7 Control Boards (previously called Water Pollution Control Boards) and the State Water Resources  
8 Control Board, and it directs each regional board to formulate and adopt a water quality control plan for  
9 all areas within the region.

10 **3.21.1.2 Solid Waste**

11 ***Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976***

12 The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act was enacted in 1976 and is the principle Federal law  
13 governing the disposal of solid waste and hazardous waste (Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Part  
14 260). The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act’s Subtitle D establishes state responsibility for  
15 regulating nonhazardous wastes, and Subtitle C controls the generation, transportation, storage, and  
16 disposal of hazardous waste through a comprehensive “cradle-to-grave” system of hazardous waste  
17 management techniques and requirements. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is responsible for  
18 implementing the law, a duty that is delegated to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control  
19 in the state of California.

20 ***California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989***

21 The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill [AB] 939) regulates  
22 nonhazardous solid waste. The law provides a solid waste management system to reduce, recycle, and  
23 reuse solid waste generated in the state to the maximum extent feasible in an efficient and cost-effective  
24 manner to conserve natural resources, to protect the environment, and to improve landfill safety. Local  
25 agencies are required to establish recycling programs, reduce paper waste, purchase recycled products,  
26 and implement integrated waste management programs that conform to the state’s requirements  
27 (California Public Resources Code section 40000 et seq.). AB 939 specifically required that each city and  
28 county in California divert 25 percent of its waste stream by 1995 and 50 percent by 2000. AB 939 states  
29 that each city and county in the state of California must manage waste disposal through the  
30 implementation of the Source Reduction and Recycling Element, which was adopted in December 1993.  
31 Under the Source Reduction and Recycling Element, counties must demonstrate how they will achieve  
32 the mandated diversion goals through the implementation of diversion programs (County of Imperial  
33 Public Works Department 2010).

34 ***Integrated Waste Management Plans***

35 Each state agency and large state facility was required to develop an integrated waste management plan  
36 by July 1, 2000. The plan was to lay out how the agency or facility would divert at least 25 percent of its  
37 solid waste from landfills or transformation facilities by January 1, 2002, and 50 percent by January 1,  
38 2004. Annual reporting on implementation of the plans is also required. Imperial County completed its  
39 Integrated Waste Management Plan by 2000 and has not updated it since its original release (personal  
40 communication, L. Davies 2010).

41 ***Imperial County General Plan***

42 The Land Use Element of the Imperial County General Plan (County of Imperial 2008) includes a number  
43 of goals and objectives that relate to providing adequate utilities and service systems within the county.

1    **3.21.2    Affected Environment**

2    **3.21.2.1    Stormwater and Flood Management**

3    Portions of Imperial County are subject to flooding, including areas within the immediate vicinity of the  
4    Salton Sea and the New and Alamo rivers (California Department of Water Resources 2010; County of  
5    Imperial 2007). The Imperial County Department of Public Works regulates stormwater management  
6    throughout the county through review of drainage plans for new development.

7    **3.21.2.2    Solid Waste**

8    Landfills are classified as Class I, Class II, and Class III. Class I landfills are designated specifically for  
9    the dumping of hazardous wastes. Class II landfills are for designated and/or special waste, including  
10    biosolids. A Class III landfill is designated for the dumping of nonhazardous wastes, such as municipal  
11    waste. Trash collection and recycling services within the county are supplied by Allied Waste  
12    Management (Imperial Valley Economic Development Corporation 2007). Imperial County currently  
13    administers and operates 10 Class III landfills, in addition to privately operated landfills. Two Class I  
14    landfills are located in California: Safety Kleen’s Buttonwillow Landfill in Kern County and Chemical  
15    Waste Management’s Kettleman Hills Landfill in Kings County. Solid waste landfills in Imperial County  
16    are operated by the County of Imperial Public Works Department and by private operators. The solid  
17    waste disposal facilities in Imperial County and Class I landfills in Kings County and Kern County are  
18    listed in Table 3.21-2.

19    In July 2010, Imperial County proposed an expansion to the Salton City Landfill to allow an increase in  
20    permitted tons per day of solid waste from 50 tons per day to as much as 6,000 tons per day by 2022, and  
21    to accept solid waste from other cities and counties in the region. The proposed expansion would increase  
22    the existing landfill’s disposal area within its property from 7.8 acres to 287 acres and would extend the  
23    life of the landfill by approximately 28 years (CEQAnet 2010).

**Table 3.21-2    Solid Waste Landfill Waste Types and Capacity**

Landfill	Class	Waste Types	Maximum Permitted Capacity (tons/day)	Maximum Permitted Capacity (cubic yards)	Remaining Capacity (cubic yards) <sup>a</sup>	Estimated Closure Date
Imperial Solid Waste Site	III	Construction/ demolition, dead animals, mixed municipal	207	1,936,000	183,817	2015
Niland Solid Waste Site	III	Construction/ demolition, mixed municipal	55	131,000	44,053	2040
Salton City Solid Waste Site <sup>b</sup>	III	Construction/ demolition, mixed municipal	10	2,581,300	11,753	2017
Allied Imperial Landfill	III	Agricultural, ash, construction/ demolition, mixed municipal, industrial, tires	1,135	4,324,200	1,901,305	2012

**SECTION 3.0**  
**AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<b>Table 3.21-2 Solid Waste Landfill Waste Types and Capacity</b>						
Landfill	Class	Waste Types	Maximum Permitted Capacity (tons/day)	Maximum Permitted Capacity (cubic yards)	Remaining Capacity (cubic yards) <sup>a</sup>	Estimated Closure Date
Monofill Facility (Brawley)	II	Industrial	750	1,729,800	1,058,2525	2025
Mesquite Regional Landfill	III	Municipal solid waste	20,000	N/A	600 million tons	2097
Chemical Waste Management Kettleman Hills Landfill (Kings County)	I	Municipal solid waste and hazardous waste	8,000	10,700,000	6,000,000	Not Available
Clean Harbors Buttonwillow Landfill (Kern County)	I	Municipal solid waste and hazardous waste	10,480	14,290,000	Not Available	2040

Source: California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery 2010.

<sup>a</sup> These estimates are from November 10, 2010; the actual number changes regularly as solid waste is disposed.

<sup>b</sup> Salton City Solid Waste Site is anticipated to expand its facility from 50 to 6,000 tons per day by 2022 (CEQAnet 2010)

1

2 **3.21.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

3 **3.21.3.1 Impact Analysis Methodology**

4 The impact assessment methodology compared the demand for utilities and service systems resulting  
 5 from the SCH alternatives to the existing capacity.

6 **3.21.3.2 Thresholds of Significance**

7 ***Significance Criteria***

8 Impacts would be significant if the SCH alternatives would:

- 9 • Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board;
- 10 • Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of
- 11 existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- 12 • Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing
- 13 facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- 14 • Require new or expanded entitlements due to lack of sufficient water supplies available to serve the
- 15 Project;

- 1 • Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the Project  
2 that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's  
3 existing commitments;
- 4 • Exceed the permitted capacity of a landfill to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs;  
5 or
- 6 • Not comply with Federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

### 7 *Application of Significance Criteria*

8 A summary of the methodology used in applying the significance criteria to the Project alternatives  
9 follows:

- 10 • **Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control**  
11 **Board** – The Project sites would be served by portable restroom facilities during both construction  
12 and operation, and all waste would be disposed of in accordance with appropriate regulations.  
13 Construction and operation of the SCH Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements,  
14 and such impacts are not addressed further. It is estimated that fewer than 50 out-of-town construction  
15 workers and their families could temporarily reside in the areas surrounding the Salton Sea during the  
16 2-year construction period. Only a small number of employees would be required during operations.  
17 These minor increases in population would not cause an exceedance of wastewater treatment  
18 requirements, and this impact is not discussed further.
- 19 • **Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or**  
20 **expansion of existing facilities** – Bottled water would be brought to the Project sites during  
21 construction and operations; therefore, no impacts on local potable water treatment facilities would  
22 occur as a direct result of construction and operation at the sites. The Project sites would be served by  
23 portable restroom facilities during both construction and operation, and the expansion or construction  
24 of wastewater treatment facilities would not be required. Impacts from out-of-town construction  
25 workers and their families temporarily residing in the area and from the permanent employees would  
26 be negligible and would not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment plants;  
27 thus, such impacts are not addressed further.
- 28 • **Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of**  
29 **existing facilities** – The Project alternatives would not require construction of new storm water  
30 drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities because pond construction would provide all  
31 necessary onsite water retention, and the Project has been designed so that diversion of water from the  
32 rivers would not cause water to back up and flood adjacent areas (refer to Section 3.11, Hydrology  
33 and Water Quality for additional discussion). The Project would not increase onsite or offsite runoff  
34 that would necessitate additional drainage infrastructure.
- 35 • **Require new or expanded entitlements due to lack of sufficient water supplies** – Construction and  
36 operations at the SCH sites would rely on bottled water for potable uses and would not require new  
37 water supplies or water entitlements. Impacts from out-of-town construction workers and their  
38 families temporarily residing in the area and from the permanent employees would be negligible and  
39 would not require new water supplies. Impacts from the use of dust suppression water during  
40 construction are addressed below.
- 41 • **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity**  
42 **to meet the Project's demand** – The Project sites would be served by portable restroom facilities  
43 during both construction and operations and would not affect the capacity of municipal or regional  
44 wastewater treatment systems; therefore, impacts on wastewater treatment systems from construction  
45 and operations at the SCH sites are not addressed. It is estimated that fewer than 50 out-of-town

1 construction workers and their families could temporarily reside in the areas surrounding the Salton  
2 Sea during the 2-year construction period; additionally, only permanent employees would be  
3 required. This minor increase in population would not cause an exceedance of wastewater treatment  
4 capacity.

- 5 • **Exceed the permitted capacity of a landfill** – The impact analysis addresses the capacity of landfills  
6 to accept solid waste generated by the SCH Project. Solid waste generated by the out-of-town  
7 construction workers and their families, as well as the permanent employees would be minor and  
8 would not cause an exceedance of solid waste capacity; such impacts are not discussed further.
- 9 • **Not comply with Federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste** – All  
10 solid waste would be disposed of in accordance with appropriate regulations.

### 11 3.21.3.3 No Action Alternative

12 As described in the *Salton Sea Ecosystem Restoration Program Programmatic Environmental Impact*  
13 *Report* (California Department of Water Resources and California Department of Fish and Game 2007),  
14 the No Action Alternative would involve construction and operations and maintenance activities for  
15 pupfish channels. Additionally, Imperial Irrigation District (IID), as mitigation for the IID Water  
16 Conservation and Transfer Project, is required to relocate campgrounds, roads, and trails that are currently  
17 located adjacent to the Salton Sea at the Salton Sea State Recreation Area, as well as boat launches along  
18 the shoreline. These actions would result in minor amounts of solid waste requiring disposal in area  
19 landfills.

20 Canals constructed along the shoreline would be designed to avoid conflicts with stormwater drainage.  
21 Therefore, no impacts to existing stormwater facilities would occur.

22 Construction workers would increase the demand for water and wastewater treatment, but it is not  
23 anticipated that new or expanded capacity would be required to meet their needs.

### 24 3.21.3.4 Alternative 1 – New River, Gravity Diversion + Cascading Ponds

25 **Impact UT-1: Dust suppression water would be required, but would not exceed existing supplies**  
26 **(less-than-significant impact)**. Water would be trucked in for dust suppression during construction; this  
27 temporary increased demand (estimated at 4,000 to 12,000 gallons per day) would be minor in  
28 comparison to the overall demand in the area (IID alone supplies approximately 2,567,000 acre-feet of  
29 water per year [IID 2010], or 836,460,629,180 gallons). Adequate supplies are available for this  
30 temporary increase; therefore, this impact would be less than significant when compared to both the  
31 existing environmental setting and No Action Alternative.

32 **Impact UT-2: Construction and operations would generate solid waste requiring disposal in**  
33 **landfills (less-than-significant impact)**. Solid waste would be generated primarily during construction.  
34 The primary sources of solid waste requiring disposal would include trash generated by work crews and  
35 equipment maintenance, as well as construction waste from building pump stations, concrete formwork,  
36 and other facilities. Approximately 100 tons would be generated through these activities. Materials  
37 generated by on-site brush clearing, as well as materials such as rock, concrete, and wood would be left  
38 on site for pond bottom substrate and would not require disposal. Sediment dredged and stockpiled during  
39 construction and during maintenance of the sedimentation basin would be incorporated back into the  
40 surrounding berms and also would not require disposal. Should testing show the presence of contaminated  
41 soil, or if such soil was observed during construction activities, such material would be hauled off site and  
42 transported to an appropriate waste facility. The local landfills and those accepting hazardous waste in  
43 Kern and Kings counties have adequate capacity to accept the types of materials that would be generated

1 during construction; therefore, impacts would be less than significant when compared to both the existing  
2 environmental setting and No Action Alternative.

3 Operations would result in minor amounts of solid waste generated by the permanent employees,  
4 equipment maintenance, and general maintenance activities. Adequate landfill capacity is available, and  
5 impacts would be less than significant when compared to both the existing environmental setting and No  
6 Action Alternative.

### 7 3.21.3.5 Alternative 2 – New River, Pumped Diversion

8 **Impact UT-1: Dust suppression water would be required, but would not exceed supplies (less-than-**  
9 **significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this alternative.

10 **Impact UT-2: Construction and operations would generate solid waste requiring disposal in**  
11 **landfills (less-than-significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this  
12 alternative.

### 13 3.21.3.6 Alternative 3 – New River, Pumped Diversion + Cascading Ponds

14 **Impact UT-1: Dust suppression water would be required, but would not exceed supplies (less-than-**  
15 **significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this alternative.

16 **Impact UT-2: Construction and operations would generate solid waste requiring disposal in**  
17 **landfills (less-than-significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this  
18 alternative.

### 19 3.21.3.7 Alternative 4 – Alamo River, Gravity Diversion + Cascading Pond

20 **Impact UT-1: Dust suppression water would be required, but would not exceed supplies (less-than-**  
21 **significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this alternative.

22 **Impact UT-2: Construction and operations would generate solid waste requiring disposal in**  
23 **landfills (less-than-significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this  
24 alternative.

### 25 3.21.3.8 Alternative 5 – Alamo River, Pumped Diversion

26 **Impact UT-1: Dust suppression water would be required, but would not exceed supplies (less-than-**  
27 **significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this alternative.

28 **Impact UT-2: Construction and operations would generate solid waste requiring disposal in**  
29 **landfills (less-than-significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this  
30 alternative.

### 31 3.21.3.9 Alternative 6 – Alamo River, Pumped Diversion + Cascading Ponds

32 **Impact UT-1: Dust suppression water would be required, but would not exceed supplies (less-than-**  
33 **significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this alternative.

34 **Impact UT-2: Construction and operations would generate solid waste requiring disposal in**  
35 **landfills (less-than-significant impact).** The discussion under Alternative 1 is applicable to this  
36 alternative.

1    **3.21.4    References**

- 2    California Department of Water Resources. 2010. *About Urban Water Management*. Website  
3        (<http://www.water.ca.gov/urbanwatermanagement/>) accessed November 3, 2010.
- 4    California Department of Water Resources and California Department of Fish and Game. 2007. Salton  
5        Sea Ecosystem Restoration Program Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report.
- 6    California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2010. *Solid Waste Facility Listings*.  
7        Website ([www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS](http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS)) accessed November 10, 2010.
- 8    CEQAnet. 2010. *Proposed Salton City Landfill Expansion Project*. Website (<http://www.ceqanet.ca.gov>)  
9        accessed November 1, 2010.
- 10   County of Imperial. 2007. Flood management plan. February.
- 11   County of Imperial. 2008. Imperial County General Plan: Land use element. Website  
12        (<http://www.icpds.com/?pid=571>).
- 13   County of Imperial Public Works Department. 2010. *Recycling*. Website  
14        (<http://www.co.imperial.ca.us/publicwork/PDFdocuments/fact%20sheet%20recycling.pdf>)  
15        accessed November 2, 2010.
- 16   Imperial Irrigation District (IID). 2010. *About IID water*. Website  
17        (<http://www.iid.com/index.aspx?page=112>) accessed on December 28, 2010.
- 18   Imperial Valley Economic Development Corporation. 2007. *Utilities*. Website  
19        (<http://www.ivedc.com/?pid=39>) accessed November 10, 2010.

20   **3.21.5    Personal Communications**

- 21   Davies, Linda. 2010. Imperial Valley Resource Management Agency. Telephone call with Jennifer  
22        Longabaugh, Dudek, November 19, 2010.

23