



## 5.6 Public Services and Utilities

---





## 5.6 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

This section is based upon information from public service and utility agencies; refer to [Appendix 13.6, \*Public Services and Utilities Correspondence\*](#). Other references include the *Azusa Light & Water 2010 Urban Water Management Plan* (July 2011) prepared by SA Associates. In the context of this EIR, the public services and utilities consist of water, wastewater (sewers), solid waste, fire protection, police protection, school, and parks and recreation. Other public services and utilities are addressed in Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not to be Significant*.

This section discusses existing conditions, which provide background information necessary to determine potential impacts of the proposed project. Criteria by which an impact may be considered potentially significant are provided, along with a discussion of impacts pursuant to Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Mitigation measures are identified to avoid or reduce potential impacts, where necessary.

### 5.6.1 EXISTING SETTING

#### WATER

##### Water Supply

The project site is served by the Azusa Light and Water Department (ALW), a municipal utility owned and operated by the City of Azusa. ALW is the largest municipally-owned water utility in the San Gabriel Valley, and serves over approximately 110,000 residents, with an expected annual population growth of 1.0 percent. ALW's service area encompasses about 8,900 acres in the San Gabriel Valley and provides service to the entire City of Azusa and portions of the cities of Glendora, Covina, West Covina, Irwindale, and unincorporated Los Angeles County.

ALW obtains its groundwater supply from the Main San Gabriel Groundwater Basin. Groundwater in the Basin is replenished by percolation from precipitation and runoff from the surrounding mountains, as well as imported water conveyed in the San Gabriel River. The total storage capacity of the basin is estimated to be approximately 8.6 to 10.5 million acre-feet, and the safe yield capacity of the basin is estimated to be 152,000 acre-feet/year. Six of ALW's 11 wells are located in the spreading grounds located near the San Gabriel River in the northwest portion of the City of Azusa. Within the Main Basin, there exists a total of six sub-basins which include the Canyon Basin (Upper and Lower), Glendora Basin, Foothill Basin, Way Hill Basin and San Dimas Basin. With the exception of Well No. 10, all of ALW's groundwater production occurs in the Canyon Basin, which has a capacity of 40,000 acre-feet and an average annual production of 30,000 acre-feet.<sup>1</sup>

ALW has access to imported Metropolitan Water District (MWD) water from the Colorado River and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta in Northern California. Imported supplies typically account for less than one percent of ALW's supply totals and is used for emergency purposes only. ALW has three interconnections to obtain water in case of an emergency: the MWD, the City of Glendora and Valley County Water District.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Azusa Light & Water, *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*, prepared by SA Associates, July 2011.

<sup>2</sup> Azusa Light & Water, *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*, prepared by SA Associates, July 2011.



## Water Demand and Existing Facilities

According to the 2005 *ALW Water Master Plan Update*, the average annual water use from 2005 to 2009 was 18,837 acre-feet. Annual water demand fluctuates each year and is dependent on climatologic conditions. In 2009 total consumption of water in the ALW service area was 21,547 acre-feet, with 179 gallons per capita per day. It is anticipated that the ALW service area would use 25,405 acre-feet/year by year 2035. ALW maintains approximately 22,000 services connections, of which, approximately 90 percent are either single family or multi-family residential. Commercial and institutional connections account for approximately 7 percent of the total current service connections while industrial connections account for almost 2 percent of the total service connections. Landscape irrigation connections and other connection account for approximately 1 percent of the total service connections. In 2009 the residential sector used 9,673 acre-feet, the commercial/institutional sector used 4,227 acre-feet, the industrial sector used 1,921 acre-feet and the landscape irrigation sector used 2,771 acre-feet.<sup>3</sup>

ALW distributes water to its 22,000 service customers through a 300 mile network of distribution mains ranging from 2 to 30 inches in size. The water system consists of five pressure zones, and two small subzones that provide modified pressure to customers. There is currently a 12-inch ALW water main on the east side of North Todd Avenue, adjacent to the project site. The City collects a water system development fee from new development for future water system infrastructure needs.<sup>4</sup>

## WASTEWATER

The City owns, operates, and maintains the local sewer lines that collect wastewater generated within the City. Local sewer lines are connected to the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) No. 22 main trunk lines.<sup>5</sup> LACSD oversees the treatment facilities that serve the City.

### Wastewater Facilities

Existing wastewater facilities serving the project site include a local sewer line that is maintained by the City that conveys wastewater to the LACSD Polymer Plant Wastewater Disposal Line Trunk Sewer, located within the intersection of North Todd Avenue and 10<sup>th</sup> Street. This 8-inch diameter trunk sewer has a design capacity of 0.5 million gallons per day (MGD) and conveyed a peak flow of 0.2 MGD when last measured in 2010.<sup>6</sup>

The City's existing sewer system includes a gravity collection system composed of pipelines and manholes. The City's total existing sewer collection system contains approximately 80 miles of sewers. These sewers range from six to 24 inches in diameter with vitrified clay as the predominant pipe material. In general, sewage flows in a southerly and westerly direction. The trunk sewer lines ultimately connect to the LACSD San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant, located next to the City of Industry, and to the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant located in the City of Carson. The San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant has a design capacity of 100 MGD and currently processes an average flow of 74.4 MGD. When wastewater entering the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Written correspondence with Melissa Barbosa, Azusa Light & Water, February 3, 2014.

<sup>5</sup> City of Azusa, *General Plan*, April 2004.

<sup>6</sup> Written Correspondence with Adriana Raza, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, January 21, 2014.



is over capacity, wastewater is diverted to the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant which provides primary and secondary wastewater treatment, and has a design capacity of 350 MGD.<sup>7</sup>

## Wastewater Generation

According to the *City of Azusa General Plan Environmental Impact Report*, the City of Azusa generates approximately 20 million gallons per day (GPD) of sewage and wastewater. Using generation factors from the City of Azusa Master Plan, it is anticipated that the City of Azusa would generate approximately 23.8 million gallons of sewage and wastewater per day by 2025. This represents a 19 percent increase in sewage and wastewater. The sewage pipes in the City of Azusa currently have the capacity to transport 48 cubic feet per second (CFS) of sewage and wastewater. The existing pipes have remaining capacity to accommodate the anticipated growth of 19 percent.

## SOLID WASTE

The City of Azusa contracts with Athens Disposal Company for solid waste collection. Athens is responsible for collecting waste and hauling it to landfills for disposal. The waste is first taken to the Athens Services' Material Recovery Facility for recycling, located in the City of Industry, and the remaining waste is hauled to the Mid-Valley Landfill in Rialto.<sup>8</sup> This landfill has a total capacity of 7,500 tons per day and has a remaining capacity of 67,520,000 cubic yards.<sup>9</sup> The City disposed of approximately 36,045 tons of solid waste in 2012.<sup>10</sup>

## FIRE PROTECTION

Fire protection is provided to the City of Azusa by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD). Fire protection services provided to the City include fire, rescue, and hazardous materials prevention and emergency services. The LACFD uses national guidelines for response time targets, which consist of five minutes for the first arriving unit for fire and eight minutes for advance life support (paramedic) in urban areas.<sup>11</sup>

Fire Stations 32 (first-due station) and 97 (second-due station) currently serve the project site. Fire Station 32 is located at 605 North Angeleno Avenue, Azusa, approximately 1.3 miles southeast of the project site, and would be the first station to respond to the project site in case of an emergency. This station is staffed with a 4-person engine company (1-fire captain, 1-fire fighter specialist, 1-fire fighter/paramedic and 1-firefighter) and a 2-person paramedic squad. Fire Station 97 is located at 18453 East Sierra Madre Avenue, Azusa, approximately 2.4 miles northeast of the project site, and would also support the project site if needed. Fire station 97 is staffed with a 4-person engine company (1-fire captain, 1-fire fighter specialist, 2-fire fighters). The response time from Fire

<sup>7</sup> City of Azusa, *City of Azusa Sewer System Master Plan*, March 2010; and Written Correspondence with Adriana Raza, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, January 21, 2014.

<sup>8</sup> Written correspondence from Talika Graham of Azusa Light & Water, dated January 22, 2014.

<sup>9</sup> Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill Facility/Site Summary, [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0055/Detail/](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0055/Detail/), accessed January 27, 2014.

<sup>10</sup> Solid waste Jurisdictional Profile for Azusa, [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/Viewer.aspx?P=OriginJurisdictionIDs%3d31%26ReportYear%3d2012%26ReportName%3dReportEDRSJurisDisposalByFacility](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/Viewer.aspx?P=OriginJurisdictionIDs%3d31%26ReportYear%3d2012%26ReportName%3dReportEDRSJurisDisposalByFacility), accessed January 24, 2014.

<sup>11</sup> Written correspondence from Frank Vidales, LACFD, dated February 20, 2014.



Station 32 to the project site is approximately 4.6 minutes. Fire protection serving the project area is currently adequate.<sup>12</sup>

## POLICE PROTECTION

The Azusa Police Department is responsible for providing general law enforcement to the City of Azusa. The Azusa Police Department is located at 725 North Alameda Avenue, which is approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the project site. This facility was upgraded in 1999 and expanded to house a total personnel of 146 sworn and non-sworn officers, as well as other equipment and related needs. The facility would accommodate a projected citywide buildout population of approximately 63,500.<sup>13</sup> The sworn officer to population ratio is approximately 1.36 sworn officers for each 1,000 residents, based on the 2011 population of 46,678 with 63 sworn officers, which is just below the target ratio of 1.4 officers to each 1,000 residents. The project site is located within Service Area 2. Current staffing levels, facilities, and level of service are considered adequate for the current population. The target response time for the Azusa Police Department is less than five minutes Priority One calls. The current response time to the project area is four and a half minutes. At this time, the Azusa Police Department does not have any plans for facility expansion or new facilities.<sup>14</sup>

## SCHOOLS

Azusa Unified School District (AUSD) provides education services to a majority of the City, including the project area. AUSD educates 10,086 kindergarten through twelfth grade students and includes eleven elementary schools, three middle schools, three high schools, and one adult school.<sup>15</sup> The project site is located nearest to Longfellow School, Victor Hodge Elementary School, Slauson Middle School and Azusa High School. Table 5.6-1, *School Information*, indicates the name, location, current enrollment, and approximate distance from the project site for the schools currently serving the project area.

**Table 5.6-1  
School Information**

School	Location	Distance from Project Site (miles)	Enrollment 2012-2013 School Year
Longfellow School	245 West 10 <sup>th</sup> Street	0.9	N/A <sup>1</sup>
Victor Hodge Elementary School	700 West Eleventh Street, Azusa	0.7	683
Slauson Middle School	340 West Fifth Street, Azusa	1.5	855
Azusa High School	240 North Cerritos Avenue	2.5	1,349

Source: California Department of Education, School Accountability Report Card, Reported Using Data from the 2012-2013 School Year, <http://www.sarconline.org/Home/Search>, accessed April 23, 2014.

<sup>1</sup> Enrollment information for this preschool/special needs facility is not publicly available.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> City of Azusa Police Department website, <http://www.ci.azusa.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=195>, accessed January 16, 2014.

<sup>14</sup> Written correspondence from Peter Hoh of the Azusa Police Department, dated January 16, 2014.

<sup>15</sup> Azusa Unified School District website, <http://ausd-ca.schoolloop.com/schools>, accessed April 23, 2014.



## PARKS AND RECREATION

The City of Azusa Recreation and Parks Department consists of the Parks, Recreation, and Senior Services divisions. The department is responsible for the creation, coordination, and implementation of recreational and social opportunities for the population. In addition, the department is responsible for the maintenance of ten public parks with over 64 acres of open space and recreation facilities as well as 12,000 parkway, median islands and City park trees.

There are approximately 64 acres of parkland within the City with an additional 186 acres available at public school facilities through joint-use agreements with Azusa Unified School District.<sup>16</sup> According to the City of Azusa General Plan Chapter 5, Policy 2.2 the City's park dedication standard is based on the National Parks and Recreation Association's recommendation per capita ratio of 5.0 acres per 1,000 persons. The U.S. Census 2010 population for the City is 46,361; therefore the City currently has parkland to resident ratio of 1.38 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. When the additional 186 acres available through public school facilities through joint agreement is included, the City has parkland to resident ratio of 5.4 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

The City of Azusa currently lacks specialized sports facilities, and only Northfield Park contains soccer fields. The City's parks also have a shortage of illuminated practice fields for a variety of organized team sports.<sup>17</sup>

The nearest park to the proposed project site that would serve potential employees within the project site is the Northside Park located at 600 North Eleventh Street. The 15-acre park is located approximately 0.8 miles from the proposed project site.<sup>18</sup>

### 5.6.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### WATER

##### Federal

##### Federal Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) authorizes the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) to set national health-based standards for drinking water to protect against both naturally-occurring and man-made contaminants that may be found in drinking water. The U.S. EPA, states, and water systems then work together to make sure that these standards are met. Originally, SDWA focused primarily on treatment as the means of providing safe drinking water at the tap. The 1996 amendments greatly enhanced the existing law by recognizing source water protection, operator training, funding for water system improvements, and public information as important components of safe drinking water. This approach ensures the quality of drinking water by protecting it from source to tap. SDWA applies to every public water system in the United

<sup>16</sup> City of Azusa, *General Plan*, April 2004 and written correspondence with Roy Chavez, Parks and Recreation, January 16, 2014.

<sup>17</sup> City of Azusa, *General Plan*, April 2004.

<sup>18</sup> Written correspondence with Roy Chavez, Parks and Recreation, January 16, 2014.



States. There are currently more than 160,000 public water systems providing water to almost all Americans at some time in their lives.

## **State of California**

### **Senate Bills 221 and 610**

Senate Bills 221 and 610 were signed into law in 2001 and took effect January 1, 2002. The two bills amended State law to better link information on water supply availability to certain land use decisions by cities and counties. The two companion bills provide a regulatory forum that requires more collaborative planning between local water suppliers and cities and counties. All Senate Bill (SB) 221 and 610 reports are generated and adopted by the public water supplier. SB 610 requires a detailed report regarding water availability and planning for additional water suppliers that is included with the environmental document for specified projects.

While SB 610 primarily affects the Water Code, SB 221 principally applies to the Subdivision Map Act. The primary effect of SB 221 is to condition every tentative map for an applicable subdivision on the applicant by verifying that the public water supplier (PWS) has sufficient water supply available to serve it. Under SB 221, approval by a city or county of certain residential subdivisions requires a written verification of sufficient water supply.

Based on the requirements of SB 610, the project does not meet the definition of a project per Section 10912 of the Water Code, and as such, SB 610 does not apply to the proposed project. Therefore, a Water Supply Assessment is not required for the project. Based on the requirements of SB 221, written verification of adequate water supply for the project is not required.

### **Assembly Bill 3030**

Assembly Bill (AB) 3030, the Groundwater Management Act, is Section 10750 et seq. of the California Water Code. AB 3030 provides local water agencies with procedures to develop a groundwater management plan so those agencies can manage their groundwater resources efficiently and safely while protecting the quality of supplies. Under AB 3030, the development of a groundwater management plan by a local water agency is voluntary. Once a plan is adopted, the rules and regulations contained therein must also be adopted to implement the program outlined in the plan. ALW has implemented a number of water conservation measures. These measures include a Drought Resistant Landscape Rebate Program (DRiP), as well as an informational water conservation website encouraging City residents to implement Smart Controllers to reduce over-watering. The ALW website also lists other conservation tips such as checking for toilet, pipe, and faucet leaks, turning off water when not in use, water lawns in early morning or late afternoon hours, plant drought resistant plants, use a timer to turn off sprinklers, etc.<sup>19</sup>

### **Efficiency Standards**

Title 24 of the California Administrative Code contains the California Building Standards, including the California Plumbing Code (Part 5), which promotes water conservation. Title 20 addresses Public Utilities and Energy and includes appliance efficiency standards that promote water

---

<sup>19</sup> Azusa Light & Water website, [www.ci.azusa.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=132](http://www.ci.azusa.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=132), accessed January 24, 2014.



conservation. In addition, a number of State laws under Titles 20 and 24 of the California Administrative Code require water-efficient plumbing fixtures in structures.

## **Regional Level**

### **2011 Urban Water Management Plan**

In accordance with State legislation, the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (USGVMWD) adopted an updated *Urban Water Management Plan (2011 UWMP)* in June 2011. The *2011 UWMP* analyzes past, current, and projected future water supply and demand as they relate to population density, types of water use, water quality, climate, water source availability and reliability, alternate water sources, and potential water shortages. In addition, USGVMWD has developed a strategy to increase water supply and reduce demand through the identification of alternative water sources, the modification of existing wells to improve capacity and drilling of new wells within the Main Basin, and the use of recycled water.

## **Local Level**

### **2010 Urban Water Management Plan**

The *2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) – Azusa Light & Water*, prepared by SA Associates for Azusa Light & Water, was adopted in July 2011 and is in compliance with the UWMP Act. The *2010 UWMP* was prepared in accordance with Division 6, Part 2.6, of the *California Water Code*, Section 10608 through 10657 as last amended by Senate Bill No. 7 (SBX7-7), which became law in November 2009. The ALW service area includes the entire City of Azusa and portions of the cities of Glendora, Covina, West Covina, Irwindale, and Los Angeles. The *2010 UWMP* projects that the Azusa Light and Water service area will have a water demand of 21,641 acre-feet (AF) in 2015 and 25,405 AF in 2035.

### **City of Azusa Municipal Code**

City of Azusa Municipal Code Chapter 78, *Utilities*, Article VI, *Water*, Division 5, *System Development Fee* establishes a water system fee structure that imposes upon future development within the water system service area. Municipal Code Chapter 78, *Utilities*, Article VI, *Water*, Division 7, *Landscape and Irrigation Standards*, states that, “No building permit shall be issued for buildings until the public works superintendent, or designee, reviews and approves a landscape plan for the project. A certificate of occupancy shall be issued only if landscaping and an irrigation system is installed in compliance with the approved landscape plan consisting of the elements set forth below. The landscape plan shall include the following elements: a calculation of water consumption for the landscaped area, a planting scheme, an irrigation plan, and a grading plan if found to be necessary by the community development director. Projects which must adhere to these standards are: apartments, condominiums, any multiple-unit residential developments, commercial developments, industrial developments, single-family residential, and recreational developments.”



## WASTEWATER

### Federal Level

#### National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

As authorized by the Clean Water Act (CWA), the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Program controls water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants into waters of the United States. Point sources are discrete conveyances such as pipes or man-made ditches. Industrial, municipal, and other facilities must obtain permits if their discharges go directly to surface waters. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The SWRCB works in coordination with the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) to preserve, protect, enhance, and restore water quality. The City is within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB.

The Municipal Storm Water Permitting Program regulates storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer (drain) systems (MS4s). Most of these permits are issued to a group of co-permittees encompassing an entire metropolitan area. The Los Angeles County Flood Control District, the County of Los Angeles, and 84 incorporated cities within the coastal watershed of Los Angeles County with the exception of the City of Long Beach discharge pollutants from their MS4s. Storm water and non-storm water enter and are conveyed through the MS4 and are discharged to surface water bodies in the Los Angeles Region. These discharges are regulated under countywide waste discharge requirements contained in Order No. R4-2012-0175, NPDES No. CAS004001, Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Discharges within the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles County, Except Those Discharges Originating from the City of Long Beach MS4, which was adopted on November 8, 2012.

### Regional Level

#### Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region

As noted above, Azusa is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The Los Angeles RWQCB develops and enforces water quality objectives and implementation plans that safeguard the quality of water resources in its region. Chapter 4 of the *Water Quality Control Plan* for the Los Angeles Region outlines policies and regulations for municipal wastewater treatment, disposal, and reclamation. The standards contained within the *Water Quality Control Plan* are designed to provide developers with a uniform approach for the design and installation of adequate systems to control wastewater and wastewater treatment/sewage disposal impacts from the City, and to prevent any potential contamination of groundwater at the discharge site.

## SOLID WASTE

#### Solid Waste Management and Resource Recovery Act of 1972

The Solid Waste Management and Resource Recovery Act of 1972 is the legislation that addresses solid waste. The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), which was created by this Act, was given broad authority related to solid waste handling, disposal, and reclamation. Under



this Act, the CIWMB initially (1) created a State solid waste management and resource recovery policy; (2) developed minimum standards for solid waste handling and disposal; and (3) approved county Solid Waste Management Plans (SWMP). The CIWMB was responsible for enforcing the legal provisions dealing with solid waste management and disposal for protecting the environment and public health and safety.

### **California Integrated Waste Management Act**

In 1989, the Legislature adopted the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939), in order to “reduce, recycle, and re-use solid waste generated in the state to the maximum extent feasible.” The term “integrated waste management” refers to the use of a variety of waste management practices to safely and effectively handle the municipal solid waste stream with the least adverse impact on human health and the environment. The law also required that each county prepare a new Integrated Waste Management Plan and each city prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) by July 1, 1991.

## **FIRE PROTECTION**

Chapter 30, Article II of the Azusa Municipal Code states that the City has adopted the 2011 Fire Code of the *Los Angeles County Code (County Fire Code)*.<sup>20</sup> The *County Fire Code* specifies regulations pertaining to fire prevention, fire hazards, land development, construction materials, and construction specifications. A copy of the code is on file at City Hall.

## **SCHOOLS**

California’s system for financing school facilities can be generally described as a cooperative effort between the state and local school districts. The state provides districts with financial support for new school construction and modernization projects through the School Facility Program (SFP). It funds the SFP through statewide, voter-approved bonds. Local school districts finance their share of school construction and modernization project costs primarily with revenue raised through local General Obligation (GO) bond elections.

### **Assembly Bill 2926**

The State of California has traditionally been responsible for the funding of local public schools. To assist in providing facilities to serve students generated by new development projects, the State passed Assembly Bill 2926 (AB 2926) in 1986. This bill allowed school districts to collect impact fees from developers of new residential and commercial/industrial building space. Development impact fees were also referenced in the 1987 Leroy Greene Lease-Purchase Act, which required school districts to contribute a matching share of project costs for construction, modernization, or reconstruction.

---

<sup>20</sup> The 2011 Fire Code is the latest version of the code adopted by the City at the time of public review of this Draft EIR. However, the City anticipates that the 2014 Fire Code will have been adopted by the time this project is plan-checked.



### **Senate Bill 50 and Proposition 1A**

Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) and Proposition 1A, both of which passed in 1998, provided a comprehensive school facilities financing and reform program, in part by authorizing a \$9.2 billion school facilities bond issue, school construction cost containment provisions, and an eight-year suspension of the Mira, Hart, and Murrieta court cases. Specifically, the bond funds are to provide \$2.9 billion for new construction and \$2.1 billion for reconstruction/modernization needs.

The provisions of SB 50 prohibit local agencies from denying either legislative or adjudicative land use approvals on the basis that school facilities are inadequate, and reinstates the school facility fee cap for legislative actions (e.g., General Plan amendments, specific plan adoption, zoning plan amendments) as was allowed under the Mira, Hart, and Murrieta court cases. The statutes state that these fees are the exclusive means of considering as well as mitigating school impacts caused by new development. Accordingly, these fees limit the scope of impact review in an EIR, the mitigation that can be imposed, and the findings a lead agency must make in justifying its approval of a Project (Government Code Sections 65995-65996). According to Government Code Section 65996, the development fees authorized by SB 50 are deemed to be “full and complete school facilities mitigation.” These provisions remain in place as long as subsequent State bonds are approved and available.

SB 50 also establishes three levels of Developer Fees that may be imposed upon new development by the governing board of a school district depending upon certain conditions within a district. Level One Fees are the statutory fees, which can be adjusted for inflation every two years. Level Two Fees allow school districts to impose fees beyond the base statutory cap, under specific circumstances. Level Three Fees come into effect if the State runs out of bond funds after 2006, which would allow school districts to impose 100 percent of the cost of the school facility or mitigation minus any local dedicated school monies. The school fee amounts provided for in Government Code §§ 65995, 65995.5, and 65995.7 would constitute full and complete mitigation for school facilities.

### **CITY OF AZUSA GENERAL PLAN**

City policies pertaining to public services and utilities are contained in the Infrastructure and Public Services Elements of the General Plan. These policies include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Monitor the demands on the water system, manage development to mitigate impacts and/or facilitate improvements to the water supply and distribution system, and maintain and expand water supply and distribution facilities. (I 2.1)
- Require that new development and retrofit existing developments to contain safeguards and measures preventing water supply degradation. (I 2.4)
- Require all new development to connect to the sewer system. (I 2.5)
- Minimize water consumption through site design, use of efficient systems, and other techniques. (I 2.6)



- Continue to require the incorporation of water conservation features in the design of all new construction and site development. (I 2.8)
- Require the use of reclaimed water for landscaped irrigation, grading, and other non-contact uses in new developments, where available or expected to be available. (I 2.10)
- Ensure the costs of improvements to the existing water supply and distribution facilities necessitated by new development to be borne by the new development benefiting from the improvements, either through the payment of fees, or the actual cost of construction, or both in accordance with State Nexus legislation. (I 2.11)
- Ensure the City provides and maintains a sewer collection and treatment facilities system that adequately conveys and treats wastewater generated by existing and planned development at a maximized cost efficiency. (I 3.1)
- Work with the County of Los Angeles to determine if the existing sewer collection systems are adequate to meet existing and anticipated future demand. (I 3.3)
- Ensure the costs of improvements to the existing sewer collection and treatment facilities necessitated by new development to be borne by the new development benefiting from the improvements, either through the payment of fees, or the actual cost of construction, or both in accordance with State Nexus legislation. (I 3.5)
- Maintain personnel and facilities in the City's Police Department necessary to provide the best response time feasible. (PS 1.1)
- Require development projects contribute fees based on their proportional impact and demand for new resources, in accordance with State Nexus legislation. (PS 1.3)
- Identify streets and intersections that are prone to congestion, thereby impeding emergency response times, and pursue mitigation to the greatest extent feasible. (PS 1.4)
- Identify streets and intersections prone to congestion, thereby impeding five minute emergency response times, and pursue remedies to the greatest extent feasible. (PS 2.3)
- Work with LACFD to ensure adequate facilities and personnel by evaluating population growth, response times, and fire hazards. (PS 2.4)
- Require new development be assessed a pro-rated fee to pay for fire facilities and personnel. (PS 2.5)
- Require all new development to design site plans and structures with fire and emergency access and safety in mind. (PS 2.6)
- Ensure that buildings and lots are maintained in a manner that is consistent with fire prevention and personal safety. (PS 2.7)



### 5.6.3 IMPACT THRESHOLDS AND SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines* contains the Initial Study Environmental Checklist form used during preparation of the project Initial Study, which is contained in Appendix 13.1 of this EIR. The Initial Study includes questions relating to public services and utilities. The issues presented in the Initial Study Checklist have been utilized as thresholds of significance in this section. Accordingly, a project may create a significant environmental impact if one or more of the following occurs with respect to each category:

#### UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (refer to Impact Statement PSU-2);
- Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects (refer to Impact Statements PSU-1 and PSU-2);
- Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects (refer to Section 5.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*);
- Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, and new or expanded entitlement is needed (refer to Impact Statement PSU-1);
- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments (refer to Impact Statement PSU-2);
- Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs (refer to Impact Statement PSU-3); and/or
- Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste (refer to Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not To Be Significant*).

#### PUBLIC SERVICES

- Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
  - Fire Protection (refer to Impact Statement PSU-4);
  - Police Protection (refer to Impact Statement PSU-5);
  - Schools (refer to Impact Statement PSU-6);



- Parks (refer to Impact Statement PSU-7); and/or
- Other Public Facilities (refer to Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not To Be Significant*).

## 5.6.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### WATER SERVICES

#### PSU-1 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WOULD NOT SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE THE DEMAND FOR WATER SUCH THAT NEW ENTITLEMENTS OR RESOURCES ARE NEEDED.

##### *Impact Analysis:*

Project implementation would result in a long-term water demand for operational uses, including restrooms, administrative uses, and landscaping. Table 5.6-2, *Estimated Water Demand*, illustrates a breakdown of the project’s estimated average total water demands. As indicated in Table 5.6-2, operation of the project would create a total potable water demand of approximately 17,132 GPD on an average day and annual water demand of approximately 16.48 AF per year.<sup>21</sup>

**Table 5.6-2  
Estimated Water Demand**

Land Use	Usage Factor	Water Demand	
		GPD	AFY
Light Industrial	8,425 GPD	8,425	6.72 <sup>1</sup>
Landscape Irrigation	40 GPM per meter (4 meters total)	8,707	9.76
<b>Total Estimated Project Demand</b>		<b>17,132</b>	<b>16.48</b>
Source: Written correspondence from Stephen Zieg, DRA Architects, dated February 13, 2014. GPD = gallons per day GPM = gallons per minute AFY = acre-feet per year <sup>1</sup> Based off assumption of water usage 5 days a week for 52 weeks a year.			

It is noted that the estimated water demand in Table 5.6-2 does not account for project compliance with Title 24 and Title 20 of the *California Administrative Code*, which relates to water conservation. Projected water demand also does not include suggested conservation measures specifically outlined by ALW. Therefore, Table 5.6-2 presents a conservative scenario of anticipated water demand, and actual water demand may be reduced.

ALW anticipates in its *2010 Urban Water Management Plan* that it would be able to accommodate the proposed project’s demand for potable water services in combination with other water demands throughout its service area through 2035. The 2010 Urban Water Management Plan projects adequate supply under normal water year, single dry year, and multiple dry year conditions. ALW’s supply reliability in the near future is expected to increase through continued upgrades to its

<sup>21</sup> Water demand rates based on written correspondence from Stephen Zieg, DRA Architects, dated February 13, 2014.



groundwater facilities, expansion of the Joseph F. Hsu Filtration Plant (from 12 to 16 MGD), continued access to imported water, and through the future potential use of recycled water. The proposed project is consistent with the City's existing General Plan and Development Code designations for the site. Thus, the project would not represent a change in the City's/ALW's anticipated land use for the site that would alter water demand projections.

A new water meter and service connection would be required to accommodate the proposed project.<sup>22</sup> The Applicant would be required to contribute fees based on the project's proportional demand for new resources, to be calculated by the director of utilities, per Municipal Code Chapter 78, *Utilities*, Article VI, *Water*, Division 5, *System Development Fee*. As such, upon compliance with existing City requirements, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact related to water supply.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

## WASTEWATER

### PSU-2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WOULD NOT RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT RELATED TO WASTEWATER DEMAND.

**Impact Analysis:** Operation of the proposed industrial/warehousing facility would result in the generation of wastewater. As noted above, the City maintains wastewater conveyance facilities that ultimately carry wastewater to LACSD conveyance and treatment facilities. The proposed project is anticipated to result in the generation of an average of 13,726 gallons of wastewater per day.<sup>23</sup>

According to the *Azusa General Plan EIR*, the sewage pipes in the City have the capacity to accommodate sewage and wastewater conveyance to accommodate buildout of the City's General Plan. As noted above, the proposed development would be consistent with the General Plan and Development Code designations for the site, and would be consistent with the City's assumptions for wastewater generation. As such, local impacts related to conveyance of wastewater from the site to LACSD facilities would not be significant.

Based on information provided by the LACSD, the LACSD anticipates that it will have adequate capacity to accommodate wastewater from the proposed project. Wastewater generated by the project will be conveyed to the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant, which has design capacity of 100 MGD and an average flow of 74.4 MGD. Wastewater flows that exceed the capacity of the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant, and all biosolids, are diverted to and treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant in Carson.<sup>24</sup> With LACSD's existing treatment capacity and minimal project-related average wastewater generation of 13,726 gallons of wastewater per day, it is not expected that the project would constrain the capacity of the existing wastewater infrastructure at the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The increase of wastewater generated on-site that would result from the project would be accommodated by existing infrastructure. The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment

<sup>22</sup> Written correspondence from Melissa Barbosa of the Azusa Light & Water Department, dated February 3, 2014.

<sup>23</sup> Written correspondence from Adriana Raza, LACSD, January 21, 2014.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.



requirements of the Los Angeles RWQCB. In addition, the project would be required to pay standard LACSD connection fees that would be utilized to construct incremental sewer system improvements as development within the LACSD service area occurs.<sup>25</sup> Any sewer system improvements implemented by LACSD would be analyzed as a separate project and would not be the direct result of the construction of the proposed project. As such, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

## SOLID WASTE

### PSU-3 THE PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS RELATED TO SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL AND LANDFILL CAPACITY.

**Impact Analysis:** Buildout of the proposed industrial and warehousing development involves a net addition of 342,629 square-feet of office and industrial/warehousing uses. Site preparation, including grading activities, and construction activities would generate typical construction debris, including wood, paper, glass, metals, cardboard, and green wastes. The project would also result in the generation of solid waste during long-term operations.

As noted above, solid waste within the City is collected by Athens Disposal Company and taken to the Athens' Material Recovery Facility for recycling, located in the City of Industry, and the remaining waste is hauled to the Mid-Valley Landfill in Rialto.<sup>26</sup> This landfill has a total capacity of 7,500 tons per day and has a remaining capacity of 67,520,000 cubic yards.<sup>27</sup> The City disposed of approximately 36,045 tons of solid waste in 2012.<sup>28</sup>

Although the project would generate solid waste during short-term construction activities, the volumes generated would not be expected to result in an exceedance of available landfill capacity. In addition, based on employment estimates for the proposed project (approximately 780 employees), it is estimated that the project would generate 6,965 tons per year of solid waste.<sup>29,30</sup> As such, it is expected that sufficient capacity would be available to serve the project; the 67,520,000 cubic yards of remaining capacity at Mid-Valley Landfill represents 67 percent of the total maximum permitted capacity of the facility. The proposed project would be subject to the Solid Waste Management and Resource Recovery Act and AB 939, which requires a 50 percent diversion of all solid waste from disposal in local landfills. As such, upon compliance with existing State regulations pertaining to solid waste, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Written correspondence from Talika Graham of Azusa Light & Water, dated January 22, 2014.

<sup>27</sup> Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill Facility/Site Summary, [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0055/Detail/](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0055/Detail/), accessed January 27, 2014.

<sup>28</sup> Solid waste Jurisdictional Profile for Azusa, [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/Viewer.aspx?P=OriginJurisdictionIDs%3d31%26ReportYear%3d2012%26ReportName%3dReportEDRSJurisDisposalByFacility](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/Viewer.aspx?P=OriginJurisdictionIDs%3d31%26ReportYear%3d2012%26ReportName%3dReportEDRSJurisDisposalByFacility), accessed January 24, 2014.

<sup>29</sup> The Natelson Company, Inc., *Employment Density Study Summary Report*, prepared for Southern California Association of Governments, October 31, 2001.

<sup>30</sup> City of Los Angeles, *City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide: Your Resource for Preparing CEQA Analyses in Los Angeles*, 2006.



**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

## FIRE PROTECTION

### **PSU-4 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WOULD NOT RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT RELATED TO THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES AND PERSONNEL.**

**Impact Analysis:** Construction activities have the potential to increase fire hazards on-site. However, LACFD reviews all development projects and requires standard conditions of approval to mitigate project-related impacts in this regard. Specifically, LACFD addresses fire and life safety requirements for project construction at the project's fire plan check stage. This includes plan review of the design details of the architectural, structural, mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems. All projects are required to comply with applicable City, County, and State code and ordinance requirements for fire protection. Thus, impacts in this regard are less than significant.

Long-term operation of the project would result in an increased daytime population at the site and may indirectly increase population in the project area through the relocation of employees to the City. However, as noted above, the LACFD currently meets its response time goal from the nearest station to the project site (4.6 minutes). Moreover, based on information provided by the LACFD, the project is not expected to create a need for additional staffing or resources upon compliance.<sup>31</sup> In addition, the proposed project would be subject to fire plan check through the LACFD Land Development Unit. Through existing LACFD requirements, the site plan would be reviewed to ensure adequate access, fire flow, sprinklering, hydrant spacing, and turning radii, among other criteria. Upon adherence to existing LACFD requirements, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

## POLICE PROTECTION

### **PSU-5 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WOULD NOT RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS RELATED TO THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL POLICE PROTECTION FACILITIES AND PERSONNEL.**

**Impact Analysis:** During the construction of the proposed project, police service requirements on the project site have the potential to increase over existing demands as a result of both increased persons and the presence of buildings and equipment on the project site. The daytime population would increase due to the presence of construction workers on the project site. This increase in daytime population would vary due to the type of construction activities being conducted (i.e., demolition, site preparation, construction of structures, or infrastructure improvements).

<sup>31</sup> Written correspondence from Frank Vidales, LACFD, dated February 20, 2014.



There is a potential for increased calls for service to the project site as a result of the increased number of persons at the project site. Due to the presence of building materials, construction and related temporary office buildings, the potential for vandalism and theft is also greater; thereby, increasing the Azusa Police Department's calls for service demands for emergency services.

The Azusa Police Department has indicated that calls for police service can be accommodated by existing staff levels; thus police staffing levels would remain the same, resulting in less than significant impacts during the short-term construction process.<sup>32</sup>

Although the project would not directly induce population growth, the proposed project would generate employment within the City. It is estimated that the project would provide 780 jobs at full capacity. As noted above, the Azusa Police Department has indicated that implementation of the proposed project would not require the expansion of police facilities or services, and that adequate services exist to serve the project site.<sup>33</sup> Thus, impacts related to police protection would be less than significant.

It should be noted that the Azusa Police Department has indicated potential traffic impacts that may occur as a result of heavy truck traffic associated with the project.<sup>34</sup> These impacts are analyzed within Section 5.2, *Traffic and Circulation*.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

## SCHOOLS

### **PSU-6 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS RELATED TO NEW OR PHYSICALLY ALTERED SCHOOL FACILITIES.**

**Impact Analysis:** The Project site is situated within the AUSD school district, as discussed above. The project does not propose new or physically altered school facilities. However, development associated with implementation of the proposed project would generate an estimated 780 employees. Employees choosing to move near the location of their employment could result in an associated increase in students attending schools within the AUSD.

In order to maintain adequate classroom seating and facilities standards, individual development projects would be required to pay statutory fees in place at the time to the AUSD in order to compensate for the impacts of development on school capacities. Pursuant to SB 50, payment of fees to AUSD is considered full mitigation for project impacts, including impacts related to the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives for schools. Therefore, project applicants would be required to pay statutory fees, so that space can be constructed, if necessary, at the nearest sites to accommodate the impact of project-generated students, reducing

---

<sup>32</sup> Written correspondence from Peter Hoh of the Azusa Police Department, dated January 16, 2014.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.



impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, Education Code Section 17620, et seq. allows school districts to collect impact fees from developers of new commercial/industrial building space. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65996, school fees imposed through the Education Code are deemed to be full mitigation for new development projects. Thus, compliance with the established regulatory framework, which requires payment of developer impact fees, would offset the cost of providing service for any additional students generated by the Project. The impacts on school services would be fully mitigated through existing State regulations and would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

## PARKS AND RECREATION

### PSU-7 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS RELATED TO PARKS OR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.

**Impact Analysis:** Project implementation has the potential to create additional demand on existing parks and recreation facilities within the City. As noted above, development associated with implementation of the proposed project would generate an estimated 780 employees. The nearest park to the proposed project site that would serve potential employees within the project site is the Northside Park located at 600 North Eleventh Street. The 15-acre park is located approximately 0.8 miles from the proposed project site.<sup>35</sup>

Although the project may result in a greater daytime population and/or additional park users through the relocation of employees to the project area, it is not anticipated that additional parks/recreational facilities would need to be constructed to serve the proposed project. There are approximately 64 acres of parkland within the City with an additional 186 acres available at public school facilities through joint-use agreements with AUSD. The City currently meets its parkland dedication standard of 5.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons with a total ratio of 5.4 acres/1,000 residents. Including the anticipated 810 new residents that may be generated within the City by the project, the City would still meet its park dedication standard with a ratio of 5.3 acres/1,000 residents.<sup>36</sup> As such, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

---

<sup>35</sup> Written correspondence with Roy Chavez, Parks and Recreation, January 16, 2014.

<sup>36</sup> Refer to Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations, for assumptions utilized to calculate project-related population increase within the City.



## 5.6.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

- **DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND OTHER RELATED CUMULATIVE PROJECTS WOULD NOT RESULT IN CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE IMPACTS TO THE WATER SUPPLY, WASTEWATER GENERATION, SOLID WASTE GENERATION, POLICE AND FIRE PROTECTION, SCHOOLS, AND PARKS AND RECREATION.**

### *Impact Analysis:*

#### **Water Supply**

There are 41 identified cumulative projects proposed in the cities of Azusa, Covina, Glendora, Duarte, and Irwindale, many of which are served by ALW. Development of these cumulative projects, in combination with the proposed project, would increase water demand throughout the project area. As noted above, ALW anticipates in its *2010 Urban Water Management Plan* that it would be able to accommodate the proposed project's demand for potable water services in combination with other water demands throughout the its service area through 2035. The 2010 Urban Water Management Plan projects adequate supply under normal water year, single dry year, and multiple dry year conditions. ALW's supply reliability in the near future is expected to increase through continued upgrades to its groundwater facilities, expansion of the Joseph F. Hsu Filtration Plant (from 12 to 16 MGD), continued access to imported water, and through the future potential use of recycled water. As such, ALW has accounted for growth and buildout within its service area through development of its *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. Water providers for identified cumulative projects outside of the ALW service area are also required by State law to prepare Urban Water Management Plans for their service areas to ensure adequate water supply on a long-term basis. Future projects would be evaluated by the responsible agency and water provider to determine the extent of impacts on existing water facilities in the region. Additionally, developers may also be required to contribute fees based on the project's proportional demand for new resources. Therefore, impacts to water facilities and water demand are not considered cumulatively considerable.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

#### **Wastewater**

The proposed project, in combination with identified cumulative development, would result in increased generation of wastewater in the project area. Ultimately, wastewater from these identified projects would be conveyed to LACSD facilities for treatment and disposal. As noted above, wastewater from the project area is conveyed to the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant, which has design capacity of 100 MGD and an average flow of 74.4 MGD. Wastewater flows that exceed the capacity of the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant, and all biosolids, are diverted to and treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant in Carson.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Written correspondence from Adriana Raza, LACSD, January 21, 2014.



The proposed project, and related cumulative projects, would be required to pay standard LACSD connection fees that would be utilized to construct incremental sewer system improvements as development within the LACSD service area occurs.<sup>38</sup> LACSD would propose improvements on an as-needed basis based on demand within the project area, and any such improvements would be subject to environmental review as a separate project by LACSD. Each project would also be subject to review by the applicable local jurisdiction to determine if any fees and/or improvements are required to implement localized conveyance improvements. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to wastewater is not considerable.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

### **Solid Waste**

Solid waste generation from approved and foreseeable cumulative projects in the project area may exacerbate regional landfill capacity. That is, any additional solid waste incrementally added to existing facilities would shorten the amount of time until they reach maximum capacity. All cumulative development within the project vicinity and Los Angeles County would be required to comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. This includes compliance with the Solid Waste Management and Resource Recovery Act and AB 939, which requires a 50 percent diversion of all solid waste from disposal in local landfills. Upon compliance with existing standards related to solid waste, project impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

### **Police Protection Services**

There are 12 additional projects proposed in the City of Azusa in addition to the proposed project which would be under the Azusa Police Department's jurisdiction. These projects propose additional residential, institutional, commercial, and office uses that would require police protection services from the Azusa Police Department. These projects would be required to comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and development codes related to police protection services. It is anticipated that existing police services would be adequate to serve the proposed project with the assumption that the projects pay the required developer fees. As service level needs increase due to increased population or other factors affecting the community, the City and Azusa Police Department would determine whether or not additional police staffing or facilities are needed. A similar review process would be required for projects located outside of the Azusa Police Department's jurisdiction. Therefore, overall cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.



## Fire Protection Services

There are 41 projects proposed in the cities of Azusa, Covina, Glendora, Duarte, and Irwindale in addition to the proposed project which would be under the LACFD's jurisdiction. These projects propose additional residential, institutional, commercial, office, hospital, and recreational uses that would require fire protection services from LACFD. These projects would be required to comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and development codes related to fire protection and emergency services. Each project would undergo fire plan check to ensure that each project is designed in accordance with LACFD standards (e.g., access and fire flow).

The LACFD has indicated that implementation of the proposed project would not require the expansion of fire protection facilities or services, and that adequate services exist to serve the project site.<sup>39</sup> Each project would be reviewed by the applicable local jurisdiction and the LACFD on a project-by-project basis to determine the need for additional staffing and/or facilities. Upon adherence to existing requirements for design through LACFD's fire plan check, it is not expected that project impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

## Schools

Azusa Unified School District (AUSD) serves students residing within the City of Azusa. Development of the proposed project and related cumulative projects would potentially generate new students affecting AUSD and surrounding school districts. Pursuant to SB 50, payment of school impact fees is considered full mitigation of project impacts, including impacts related to the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives for schools. Therefore, individual project applicants would be required to pay the statutory fees, so that facilities may be constructed, if necessary, to accommodate additional demand. As such, impacts related to schools are not considered cumulatively considerable.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

## Parks and Recreation

Development associated with implementation of the proposed project and related cumulative projects within the City would increase demand on City parks and recreation facilities. As noted above, the City currently meets its parkland dedication standard of 5.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons with a total ratio of 5.4 acres/1,000 residents. Including the anticipated new residents that may be generated within the City by the project, the City would still meet its park dedication standard. Each affected jurisdiction would evaluate potential demand for additional parks/recreational facilities on a project-by-project basis and through regional planning programs

---

<sup>39</sup> Written correspondence from Frank Vidales, County of Los Angeles Fire Department, dates February 20, 2014.



(i.e., the City reviews park and recreation needs every five years in accordance with General Plan Recreation Policy 4.1). Thus, project effects related to parks and recreation are not considered cumulatively considerable.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

### **5.6.6 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

No unavoidable significant impacts related to public services and utilities have been identified.