

4.12 Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy

This section evaluates the potential impacts on utilities, service systems, and energy resulting from implementation of the proposed project. This includes the potential for the proposed project to conflict with or obstruct existing capacity and future implementation of utilities and service systems or to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in demand for services. Utilities and service systems that currently serve the surrounding project area and would be extended to serve the proposed project site include wastewater, water, solid waste, and energy. Storm water and associated drainage facilities are addressed in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality). The disposal of hazardous waste is discussed in Section 4.7 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials).

Information contained in this section is based upon written communication with the County of Los Angeles Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District (CSMD 2010), the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSD 2010), the Golden State Water Company (GSWC 2010), Southern California Gas Company (GC 2010), Southern California Edison (SCE 2010) and other sources as cited throughout the section. Appendix J of this EIR provides copies of the utility service provider's written communication.

4.12.1 Environmental Setting

4.12.1.1 Wastewater

The existing caretaker's residence on the project site disposes of wastewater through a septic leach field. The CSMD, through the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Sewer Maintenance Division, is responsible for the maintenance of local sewers within the City of San Dimas. The CSMD system serves over one-half million parcels and a population of approximately 2.3 million people. The CSMD service area includes unincorporated areas of the county of Los Angeles, 38 cities, and two contract cities. The CSMD system includes over 4,600 miles of sanitary sewers, 153 pump stations, and four wastewater treatment plants (CSMD 2010). The CSMD trunk sewer closest to the proposed project site is an eight-inch line located to the south of the project site, beneath Cataract Avenue.

Within the vicinity of the proposed project site, local sewers operated and maintained by CSMD transport sewage flows to the CSD sewer mains for treatment. CSD sewer mains transport sewage to the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) for treatment. The San Jose Creek WRP is located in the City of Industry, has a design capacity of 100 million gallons per day (mgd) and is operated and maintained by CSD. Currently, the San Jose Creek WRP processes an average flow capacity of 75.3 mgd. The CSD trunk sewer closest to the proposed project site is an eight-inch line located in Amelia Avenue between Country Oak Road and Baseline Road.

4.12.1.2 Water Supply

The existing project site is primarily undeveloped and requires little potable water. Aside from water tanks that serve the existing caretaker's residence, no water supply infrastructure exists on site. The proposed project site would be provided with potable water from the GSWC, which is an investor-owned public utility company regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission. GSWC operates the San Dimas water system which serves the City of San Dimas, portions of the cities of La Verne, Walnut, Covina, and a portion of the adjacent unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. GSWC

obtains its water supply for the San Dimas water system from four sources: 1) local groundwater from the Main San Gabriel Groundwater Basin; 2) imported water from the Three Valleys Municipal Water District (TVMWD); 3) local water from the Covina Irrigating Company (CIC); and 4) untreated surface water from San Dimas Canyon Creek. Further discussion of the existing water supply is contained in Chapter 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Table 4.12-1 summarizes the current and planned water supplies available to GSWC for the San Dimas water system in the existing service area. As shown in this table, adjudicated groundwater makes up between 15 and 22 percent of the available water supply presently used by GSWC, whereas purchased water makes up between 68 and 79 percent. Surface diversion sources make up about three percent of available supply. To meet projected water demand for the service area, GSWC UWMP analyzed an increase in water supply by about 52 percent from 2005 to 2030, with the majority of this demand being met through purchased water from TVMWD and CIC (GSWC UWMP2005). The closest GSWC existing water supply line to the proposed project site is located to the south of the site, in Cataract Avenue. This is the supply line to which the proposed project plans to connect.

**Table 4.12-1 Golden State Water Company San Dimas Water System
Current and Planned Water Supplies (in acre-feet per year)**

Water Supply Source	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Purchased water from Three Valleys Municipal Water District	10,509	12,323	13,878	15,442	16,991	18,517
Purchased water from Covina Irrigating Company	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Groundwater Basin ⁽¹⁾	3,436	3,436	3,436	3,436	3,436	3,436
Surface Diversion ⁽²⁾	500	500	500	500	500	500
Recycled water	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	15,445	17,259	18,814	20,378	21,927	23,453

⁽¹⁾ Groundwater supply based on GSWC’s share of the projected Main San Gabriel Basin operating safe yield for the San Dimas System. Based on groundwater adjudication, GSWC’s supply modeling does not include any increase in groundwater supply allocated to GSWC. If additional groundwater were allocated to GSCW then there would be additional supply.

⁽²⁾ Surface Diversion rights may be taken as surface water, groundwater, or a combination, based on availability of each water supply.

Source: GSWC UWMP 2005

4.12.1.3 Solid Waste

The City of San Dimas contracts with Waste Management for curbside trash collection and recycling. Waste Management is the leading provider of waste disposal and environmental services in North America. Nationally, the company serves nearly 20 million municipal, commercial, industrial and residential customers through a network of 367 collection operations, 355 transfer stations, 273 active landfill disposal sites, 16 waste-to-energy plants, 134 recycling plants, and 111 beneficial-use landfill gas projects.

Waste collected at the proposed project site would be disposed of at the Puente Hills landfill and the Puente Hills Materials Recovery Facility (MRF). The Puente Hills landfill is located in the unincorporated area of the Los Angeles County, next to the City of Whittier, and south of the Pomona freeway and San

Gabriel freeway intersection. The Puente Hills landfill is owned and operated by CSD. The closure date of the Puente Hills landfill is October 31, 2013. Upon closure of this landfill, solid waste will be collected and sorted at the Puente Hills MRF and then transported by CSD, via rail, to a disposal landfill in Imperial or Riverside County.

4.12.1.4 Energy

The proposed project site is primarily undeveloped and currently has minimal energy use. SCE provides electrical service and the Southern California Gas Company (Gas Company) provides natural gas service to the project site.

Southern California Edison

SCE is one of the nation's largest electric utility providers, serving more than 14 million people in a 50,000-square-mile area of central, coastal and southern California, excluding the city of Los Angeles and certain other cities. As a company, SCE's service territory includes more than 180 cities with approximately 4,990 transmission and distribution circuits and 425 transmission and distribution crews. SCE's closest electrical facilities to the proposed project site are located along Cataract Avenue and Country Club Drive in the City of Glendora.

Southern California Gas Company

The Gas Company is the nation's largest natural gas distribution utility and provides service to approximately 20.5 million consumers through 5.7 million meters of pipeline in more than 500 communities. The company's service territory encompasses approximately 20,000 square miles throughout central and southern California, from the City of Visalia to the Mexican border. The Gas Company is a subsidiary of Sempra Energy. The closest existing natural gas facility to the proposed project site is a three-inch natural gas main, located to the south of the project site in Cataract Avenue.

4.12.1.5 Telecommunications

The proposed project site is primarily undeveloped and currently has minimal telecommunication facilities. Telephone service is provided by Verizon and cable service is provided by Time Warner Cable. The closest existing telephone and cable infrastructure is located south of the proposed project site, along Cataract Avenue.

4.12.2 Regulatory Framework

4.12.2.1 Federal

Safe Drinking Water Act

Passed in 1974 and amended in 1986 and 1996, the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) gives the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) the authority to set drinking water standards. Drinking water standards apply to public water systems, which provide water for human consumption through at least 15 service connections, or regularly serve at least 25 individuals. There are two categories of drinking water standards, the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWR) and the National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations (NSDWR). The NPDWR are legally enforceable standards that apply to

public water systems. NPDR standards protect drinking water quality by limiting the levels of specific contaminants that can adversely affect public health and are known or anticipated to occur in water.

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) was designed to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the waters in the United States. The CWA also directs states to establish water quality standards for all waters of the United States and to review and update such standards on a triennial basis. Other provisions of the CWA related to basin planning include Section 208, which authorizes the preparation of waste treatment management plans, and Section 319, which mandates specific actions for the control of pollution from nonpoint sources. The EPA has delegated responsibility for implementation of portions of the CWA to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs), including water quality control planning and control programs, such as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The NPDES program is a set of permits designed to implement the CWA that apply to various activities that generate pollutants with potential to impact water quality.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 contains important provisions concerning the placement of towers and other facilities for use in providing wireless services. This law established new responsibilities for communities and for the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Section 704 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "1996 Act") governs federal, state and local government oversight for the siting of "wireless service" facilities. The 1996 Act established a comprehensive framework for the exercise of jurisdiction by state and local zoning authorities over the construction, modification and placement of facilities such as towers for cellular, personal communications service (PCS), and specialized mobile radio (SMR) transmitters. The following are important components of the 1996 Act:

1. The law preserves local zoning authority, but clarifies when the exercise of local zoning authority may be pre-empted by the FCC.
2. Section 704 prohibits any action that would discriminate between different providers of personal wireless services, such as cellular, wide-area SMR and broadband PCS. It also prohibits any action that would ban altogether the construction, modification or placement of these kinds of facilities in a particular area.
3. The law specifies procedures which must be followed for acting on a request to place these kinds of facilities, and provides for review in the courts or the FCC of any decision by a zoning authority that is inconsistent with Section 704.
4. Section 704 requires the federal government to take steps to help licensees in spectrum-based services, such as PCS and cellular, get access to preferred sites for their facilities.

Section 704(a) of the 1996 Act expressly pre-empts state and local government regulation of the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the FCC's regulations concerning such emissions (47 USC Section 332(c)(7)(B)(iv)).

4.12.2.2 State

California Drinking Water Standards

State drinking water standards are based on federal standards and are listed in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. California drinking water standards were last updated and adopted in April 2009. The California Department of Health Services administers the state drinking water standards under the state Drinking Water Program (DWP). The DWP regulates public water systems; oversees water recycling projects; permits water treatment devices; certifies drinking water treatment and distribution operators; supports and promotes water system security; provides support for small water systems and for improving technical, managerial, and financial capacity, and provides funding opportunities for water system improvements.

California Water Code

The California Water Code, last updated in 2009, contains provisions that control almost every consideration of water and its use. According to Division 2 of the California Water Code, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) shall consider and act upon all applications for permits to appropriate waters. Division 6 of the Water Code controls conservation, development and utilization of the state water resources. Division 7 addresses water quality protection and management.

Senate Bill 610

SB 610, which took effect on January 1, 2002 and has been codified in the California Water Code beginning with Section 10910, requires the preparation of a water supply assessment (WSA) for projects within cities and counties that propose to construct 500 or more residential units or the equivalent. SB 610 stipulates that when environmental review of certain large development projects is required, the water agency that is to serve the development must complete a WSA to evaluate water supplies that are or will be available during normal, single-dry and multiple-dry years during a 20-year projection to meet existing and planned future demands, including the demand associated with the project.

Senate Bill 221

Enacted in 2001, SB 221, which has been codified in Government Code 66473.7, requires that the legislative body of a city or county which is empowered to approve, disapprove or conditionally approve a subdivision map must condition such approval upon proof of sufficient water supply or receipt of a written verification of water supply from the water provider. The term "sufficient water supply" is defined in SB 221 as the total water supplies available during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years within a 20-year projection that would meet the projected demand associated with the proposed subdivision. The definition of sufficient water supply also includes the requirement that sufficient water encompass not only the proposed subdivision, but also existing and planned future uses, including, but not limited to, agricultural and industrial uses. SB 221 requirements do not apply to the general plans of cities or counties, but rather to specific development projects that require a subdivision map.

California Code of Regulations Energy Efficiency Standards - Title 24, Part 6

The Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings were established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. The California Energy Commission adopted 2008 Standards on April 23,

2008 and the Building Standards Commission approved them for publication on September 11, 2008. The 2008 updates became effective on August 1, 2009. The California Energy Commission adopted the 2008 changes to the Building Energy Efficiency Standards for several reasons:

1. To provide California with an adequate, reasonably priced, and environmentally sound supply of energy;
2. To respond to AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which mandates that California must reduce its GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020;
3. To pursue California energy policy that energy efficiency is the resource of first choice for meeting California's energy needs;
4. To act on the findings of California's Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) that concludes that the Standards are the most cost effective means to achieve energy efficiency, expects the Building Energy Efficiency Standards to continue to be upgraded over time to reduce electricity and peak demand, and recognizes the role of the Standards in reducing energy related to meeting California's water needs and in reducing GHG emissions;
5. To meet the West Coast Governors' Global Warming Initiative commitment to include aggressive energy efficiency measures into updates of state building codes; and
6. To meet the Executive Order in the Green Building Initiative to improve the energy efficiency of nonresidential buildings through aggressive standards.

California Integrated Waste Management Act – Assembly Bill 939

The California Integrated Waste Management Act (IWMA) was enacted by the California Legislature in 1989 with the goal of reducing dependence on landfills for the disposal of solid waste, and to ensure an effective and coordinated system for the safe management of all solid waste generated within the state. The IWMA established a hierarchy of preferred waste management practices which include: 1) source reduction; 2) reuse of resources; 3) recycling and composting; and 4) environmentally safe disposal by transformation or landfill. It addresses all aspects related to solid waste regulation including the details regarding the lead enforcement agency's requirements and responsibilities, the permit process including inspections and denials of permits, enforcement, and site clean-up and maintenance.

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The 1969 Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, codified in the California Water Code, authorizes the SWRCB to implement programs to control polluted discharges into state waters. This law essentially implements the requirements of the CWA. Pursuant to this law, the local Regional Water Quality Control Board is required to establish the wastewater concentrations of a number of specific hazardous substances in treated wastewater discharge.

State Water Resources Control Board

In California, the SWRCB is responsible for ensuring the highest reasonable quality of waters of the state, while allocating those waters to achieve the optimum balance of beneficial uses. The SWRCB's current challenge is exacerbated by California's rapid population growth, and the continuing struggle over precious water flows. It faces tough new demands which include fixing ailing sewer systems; building new wastewater treatment plants; and tackling the cleanup of underground water sources impacted by the very technology and industry that has catapulted California into global prominence.

Additionally, the SWRCB will continue to focus on its most vexing problem of nonpoint source pollution, or polluted runoff, which is difficult to categorize, isolate and resolve.

Urban Water Management Planning Act - California Water Code Sections 10610-10656

In 1983, the California State Legislature enacted the Urban Water Management Planning Act (California Water Code Sections 10610 through 10656) which requires every urban water supplier that provides water to 3,000 or more customers, or provides over 3,000 AF of water annually, to make every effort to ensure the appropriate level of reliability in its water service to meet the needs of its customers during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. The Act describes the contents of UWMPs as well as how urban water suppliers should adopt and implement the plans. It was the Legislature's intent to permit levels of water management planning commensurate with the number of customers served and the volume of water supplied.

Water Conservation Projects Act

The State of California's requirements for water conservation are codified in the Water Conservation Projects Act of 1985 (California Water Code Sections 11950 through 11954), which encourages local agencies and private enterprise to implement potential water conservation and reclamation projects.

California Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and Assembly Bill 1881

In 1993, the California Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance became law and in 2006, Assembly Bill 1881 required that the Department of Water Resources (DWR) update the ordinance. Pursuant to this law, DWR prepared a Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance for use by local agencies that include provisions to minimize landscape irrigation overspray and runoff, provide appropriate use and groupings of plants, encourage the use of recycled water and stormwater onsite, and encourage landscape maintenance practices that foster long-term landscape conservation. Assembly Bill 1881 required that all local agencies must adopt the state Model Ordinance or craft an ordinance to fit local conditions by January 1, 2010. The City of San Dimas addressed the objectives of the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance by incorporating new water efficient landscape requirements into Chapter 19.67 of its Zoning Ordinance. Updates to the City's existing water efficient landscape requirements included establishing water budgets, irrigation systems and schedules, overhead irrigation restrictions, turf restrictions, and monitoring and enforcement.

4.12.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.12.3.1 Issue 1 – Wastewater Treatment

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy Issue 1 Summary

Would implementation of the proposed project result in an exceedence of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board's wastewater treatment requirements or the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County's treatment capacity to serve the project's projected demand?

Impact: The project includes annexation of the project site into the service areas of CSD and the CSMD. This action would ensure the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements and would have adequate treatment capacity.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Standards of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant adverse impact if it would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) or if CSD, the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the proposed project site, would not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would result in the construction of 61 single-family residential homes, which would result in increased wastewater treatment demand. The proposed project site is currently not included within the existing service area boundary of any sewer districts. As part of the proposed project, the site would be annexed into the service areas of the CSD and the CSMD. These annexations would require approval from the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for the Los Angeles County.

Wastewater generated at the proposed project site would be transported, via local CSMD sewer lines, to CSD sewer lines and ultimately the San Jose Creek WRP for treatment. As discussed above, the San Jose Creek WRP has a design capacity of 100 mgd and currently processes an average flow capacity of 75.3 mgd. CSD evaluated the proposed project and determined the expected average wastewater flow from the project is approximately 15,860 gallons per day (CSD 2010). Therefore, the CSD has adequate capacity to serve the wastewater flow from the project site at their existing facility and the proposed project would not require the need for new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities.

With regard to wastewater treatment requirements, the proposed project would generate types of waste that are typical of residential developments. The San Jose Creek WRP provides primary, secondary and tertiary treatment to a service population of approximately one million people, and is permitted by the LARWQCB to treat waste from residential uses. Therefore, the San Jose Creek WRP

would be able to treat the types of wastewater generated by the proposed residential project. As such, the proposed project would not generate waste that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the LARWQCB.

Summary

The proposed project would be served by a wastewater treatment provider with adequate capacity to serve the project’s expected average wastewater flow and would not generate waste types that would violate the wastewater treatment standards of the LARWQCB. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts associated with adequate wastewater treatment capacity or treatment violations; therefore, mitigation is not required.

4.12.3.2 Issue 2 – New Water or Wastewater Facilities

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy Issue 2 Summary	
Would implementation of the proposed project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities?	
Impact: Implementation of the proposed project would require the construction of new on-site water and wastewater facilities that would result in potentially significant impacts on the environment.	Mitigation: Applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR (aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources and greenhouse gas emissions).
Significance Before Mitigation: Significant.	Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Standards of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant adverse impact if it would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would construct 61 new single-family residences which would require water and wastewater treatment services. The project site does not contain existing water and wastewater pipelines and related infrastructure; therefore, new water and wastewater facilities would need to be constructed to serve the proposed project. These issues are discussed further below.

Water

The existing project site is primarily undeveloped, is outside of the existing GSWC tariff line and does not contain any GSWC water supply infrastructure. As part of the proposed project, a tariff line extension from GSWC would be obtained. The tariff line extension would also require approval from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). This tariff line extension would allow GSWC to provide potable water to the project site. The provision of an adequate water supply and is discussed below in Section 4.12.3.4, Issue 4 – Water Supply Availability.

The proposed project would require the construction of on-site water infrastructure to serve the proposed residential development. A new eight-inch water pipeline would be constructed and connected to an existing off-site GSWC water supply pipeline near the intersection of Cataract Avenue and Dalepark Drive. The existing off-site GSWC supply line is sized adequately to serve the proposed project and would not require expansion. The new eight-inch water main would extend northeasterly under proposed on-site roadways, including Brasada Lane, to the proposed 750,000 gallon on-site water storage tank located in the eastern central portion of the project site. In order to convey the water uphill to the water tank, a water pump station would be constructed in the southwest portion of the project site, north of the project's main entry gate, near the connection with the existing GSWC supply line in Cataract Avenue. The proposed water storage tank would provide water storage for use within the project site and water supply for emergency fire service. As discussed in Section 4.1 (Aesthetics) the water tank would be set into a hillside and would be painted and landscaped to blend into the terrain. Another eight-inch water main would be constructed under the proposed project roadways from the water tank downhill to serve the proposed residences.

The construction and operation of the proposed on-site water infrastructure would have the potential to cause direct environmental effects to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources and greenhouse gas emissions. These facilities are included as part of the proposed project and have been analyzed as part of this EIR. Impacts to aesthetics would occur from the construction of an aboveground water pump station and water storage tank. Impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would result from air pollutant emissions during project construction and the operation of the on-site pump station. Biological resources have the potential to be disturbed from the removal of vegetation during construction of utilities infrastructure, including pipelines, the pump station and the water tank. Cultural resources also have the potential to be impacted from ground disturbing activities during construction. These environmental impacts are anticipated to be less than significant or would be mitigated to below a level of significance as discussed in the following EIR sections: 4.1 Aesthetics, 4.2 Air Quality, 4.3 Biological Resources, 4.4 Cultural Resources, and 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Sewer

The existing project site is primarily undeveloped and does not contain any CSMD or CSD wastewater infrastructure because it is outside of these agencies' service areas. As part of the proposed project, the project site would be annexed into the CSMD and CSD service areas, which would require approval from Los Angeles County LAFCO. These service area extensions would allow CSMD and CSD to provide wastewater services to the proposed project site.

The proposed project would require the construction of on-site wastewater infrastructure to serve the proposed residential development. A new eight-inch wastewater pipeline would be constructed and connected to an existing eight-inch CSMD wastewater pipeline located beneath Cataract Avenue. This

off-site sewer line has adequate capacity to serve the proposed project and would connect to existing CSD wastewater facilities to convey wastewater flows to the San Jose Creek WRF. The CSD facilities are also adequately sized to serve the proposed project and would not require expansion.

The proposed on-site eight-inch wastewater pipeline would extend northerly from the connection with the existing CSMD pipeline in Cataract Avenue under proposed project roadways to serve the proposed residences. The construction of the wastewater pipelines would have the potential to cause direct environmental effects including air quality, biological resources, cultural resources and greenhouse gas emissions. These facilities are included as part of the proposed project and have been analyzed as part of this EIR. Impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would result from construction-related air pollutant emissions. Biological resources have the potential to be disturbed from the removal of vegetation during utility installation and cultural resources have the potential to be impacted from ground-disturbing activities during underground utility installation. These environmental impacts are anticipated to be less than significant or would be mitigated to below a level of significance as discussed in the following EIR sections: 4.2 Air Quality, 4.3 Biological Resources, 4.4 Cultural Resources, and 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Summary

Implementation of the proposed project would require the construction and operation of new on-site water and wastewater facilities, which would have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of applicable mitigation measures in the following sections of this EIR would reduce impacts related to the construction of new on-site water and wastewater facilities to a level less than significant: 4.1 Aesthetics, 4.2 Air Quality, 4.3 Biological Resources, 4.4 Cultural Resources, and 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

4.12.3.3 Issue 3 – New Storm Water Facilities

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy Issue 3 Summary

Would implementation of the proposed project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities which could cause adverse effects on the environment?

Impact: Implementation of the proposed project would create additional runoff which would require the construction of new storm water facilities that may have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Mitigation: Applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR (air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and hydrology and water quality).

Significance Before Mitigation: Significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Standards of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant adverse impact if it would require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would result in new residential development on a mostly undeveloped site, which would increase the amount of on-site impermeable surfaces from the development of rooftops, roads and driveways. Currently, the majority of the project site is undeveloped land that does not support or require storm water drainage facilities. As discussed in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality), development of the proposed project would result in minor changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site and a slight increase in peak flows from the site. These changes would result in the need for the design and construction of new storm water drainage facilities to route the runoff water through the site. Additionally, the existing storm drain system at the northern terminus of Cataract Avenue is currently deficient and flooding in the area is common during large rain events. Therefore, the proposed project would require the construction of new stormwater facilities in Cataract Avenue and on the project site and easement area, including terrace drains, debris basins, water quality basins and joint water quality/debris basins. Stormwater improvements would be constructed to maintain the existing drainage patterns of the proposed project site and would divert both on-site runoff and off-site runoff that could potentially impact the proposed project site. A more detailed discussion of site drainage improvements is provided in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

The proposed project would construct a storm water drainage system and other drainage features to serve the proposed residential development. All stormwater drainage facilities would be constructed on-site or within the proposed easement area immediately south of the proposed project site. The construction of proposed storm water drainage facilities would have the potential to cause direct environmental effects to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions and hydrology. The construction of storm water drainage facilities are included as part of the proposed project and have been analyzed as part of this EIR. Impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would result from construction-related air pollutant emissions. Biological resources have the potential to be disturbed from the removal of vegetation during the construction of stormwater facilities and cultural resources have the potential to be impacted from ground-disturbing activities. In addition, if not properly designed, an improper storm drain system could also substantially alter the existing hydrology of the project site and surrounding areas. These environmental impacts are anticipated to be less than significant or would be mitigated to below a level of significance as discussed in the following EIR sections: 4.2 Air Quality, 4.3 Biological Resources, 4.4 Cultural Resources, 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality.

Summary

Implementation of the proposed project would require the construction of on- and off-site stormwater facilities, which would have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of applicable mitigation measures in the following sections of this EIR would reduce impacts related to the construction of new storm water facilities to a less than significant level: 4.2 Air Quality, 4.3 Biological Resources, 4.4 Cultural Resources, 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality.

4.12.3.4 Issue 4 – Water Supply Availability

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy Issue 4 Summary	
Would implementation of the proposed project result in insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or new or expanded entitlements needed?	
<p>Impact: The proposed project requires a tariff line extension from GSWC, to serve the proposed project site with water. GSWC’s 2005 UWMP accounts for future growth in the region; therefore, it is anticipated that GSWC would have adequate water supplies to serve the proposed project.</p>	<p>Mitigation: No mitigation is required.</p>
<p>Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.</p>	<p>Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.</p>

Standards of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant adverse impact if sufficient water supplies are not available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or new or expanded entitlements are needed.

Impact Analysis

Implementation of the proposed project is estimated to increase water demand by a maximum of approximately 50 million gallons per year for outdoor and indoor residential uses, as well as water uses for landscape in common areas. This is considered a worst-case demand scenario. The actual project water demand would likely decrease with implementation of drought tolerance landscaping. As described above, water would be provided to the project site by GSWC through a tariff line extension from the existing San Dimas system. A discussion of GSWC’s water supply and ability to serve the project site with water is provided below.

Water supply projections for the existing GSWC service area are identified in the GSWC 2005 UWMP and provided in Table 4.12-1, Golden State Water Company San Dimas Water System Current and Planned Water Supplies, above. Water demand projections prepared for the 2005 UWMP for the GSWC service area are identified in Table 4.12-2 below, Golden State Water Company San Dimas Water System Current and Planned Water Demand. As identified in Table 4.12-1, GSWC’s total projected water supply in 2030 was anticipated in the 2005 UWMP to be approximately 23,453 acre-feet per year. As shown in Table 4.12-2, GSWC’s total projected water demand in 2030 was anticipated in the 2005 UWMP to be 23,453 acre feet per year. Based on this information, the GSWC 2005 UWMP determined that adequate

water supplies would be available to serve the existing and projected demand of the GSWC service area under normal water year, single-dry water year and multiple-dry water year conditions through the year 2030.

As discussed above, the proposed project is anticipated to result in a maximum demand of approximately 50 million gallons per year, or approximately 153 acre-feet per year. This is considered a worst-case demand scenario. The actual project water demand would likely decrease with implementation of drought tolerance landscaping. Based on this estimate, implementation of the proposed project would increase GSWC water demand from 23,453 acre-feet per year to a maximum of 23,606 acre-feet per year in 2030, a 0.65 percent increase. However, there are a number of projects that were accounted for in the UWMP as planned future growth that have not been built. Additionally, line loss savings can reasonably be expected to occur for future projects, based on state-required conservation and engineering. The California Urban Water Conservation Council has developed a set of 14 best management practices (BMPs), including low flow toilets and washing machines, residential retrofits, and rate adjustments that are expected to reduce water demand on a state wide level.

**Table 4.12-2 Golden State Water Company San Dimas Water System
Current and Planned Water Demand (in acre-feet per year)**

Calendar Year	Projected Water Sales	Unaccounted for System Losses	Total Water Demand
2015	17,534	1,280	18,814
2020	18,992	1,386	20,378
2025	20,436	1,491	21,927
2030	21,858	1,595	23,453

Notes:

1. This table is based on the Department of Water Resources Guidebook Table 15.
2. Based on calendar year.
- * DRW's line loss is a statewide estimate of approximately 7.3 percent. Many local jurisdictions record lower line loss, based on engineering and implementation of water conservation measures. Line loss can be as low as 2 percent.

Source: GSWC UWMP 2005

The proposed project requires a tariff map extension from GSWC to include the project site in the GSWC tariff area, which would allow GSWC to serve the project site with potable water. This action requires the approval of the CPUC. Upon tariff map extension, the proposed project demands would be incorporated into the GSWC service area and thereafter future water supply and demand projections for the GSWC would include the proposed project site. Because the 2005 GSWC UWMP accounts for future growth in the Los Angeles area, certain projects identified in the UWMP have not been built, line loss is reasonably likely to reduce and water conservation measures will reduce actual water demand for existing and future development, it is anticipated that the GSWC would have adequate water supplies to serve the proposed project. GSWC has indicated that it may require the project applicant to provide new water supplies, such as entitlements to groundwater or purchased water, as part of a contractual and financial arrangement to provide water service to the proposed project site. The potential environmental impacts associated with the provision of any new water supplies is not included in the analysis of this EIR and would require subsequent environmental review pursuant to CEQA, should it be necessary.

Summary

As part of the proposed project, a tariff line extension from GSWC would be required to allow GSWC to serve the project site with potable water. GSWC's 2005 UWMP accounts for future growth in the Los Angeles area, and the proposed 61-unit residential project would result in a negligible contribution to total water demand. Therefore, it is anticipated that the GSWC would have adequate water supplies to serve the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to water supply; therefore, no mitigation is required.

4.12.3.5 Issue 5 – Landfill Capacity

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy Issue 5 Summary

Would the proposed project be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the proposed project's solid waste disposal needs?

Impact: The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to accept the project's solid waste disposal needs.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Standards of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant adverse impact if it would be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs generated by the proposed project.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would result in the development of 61 single-family residences on a primarily undeveloped site, which would increase the site's solid waste disposal needs over existing conditions. Solid waste disposal for the proposed project would be provided by Waste Management and transported to the Puente Hills landfill. The Puente Hills landfill has an operating capacity of 13,200 tons per day (tpd). Currently, this landfill receives approximately 6,000 tpd. Solid waste received at this landfill originates from residential, demolition and commercial activities, each contributing equally to the solid waste stream. It is anticipated that in October 2013 the capacity of the Puente Hills landfill will be reached and this landfill facility will close. Upon closure of this facility, and to solve the projected shortfall in local disposal capacity, the CSD plans to implement a Waste-by-Rail program that would provide the transport of solid waste by rail to distant disposal facilities to ensure long-term disposal capacity for the region. According to the Waste-by-Rail" program, solid waste would be collected at the

Puente Hills MRF, located adjacent to the Puente Hills landfill, and shipped through an intermodal rail yard to a landfill located outside Los Angeles County.

Within Southern California, two landfills are proposed to receive waste from the Puente Hills MRF via rail. These include the Mesquite Regional Landfill in Imperial County and the Eagle Mountain Landfill in Riverside County. Both landfills are located approximately 200 miles east of Los Angeles along the Union Pacific Railroad. Based upon CSD calculations, the capacity of these remote disposal sites would serve the solid waste disposal needs of Los Angeles County for the next 100 years (CSD 2010b). Therefore, the Waste-by-Rail program would ensure that the proposed project is served by a landfill that has sufficient solid waste disposal capacity.

Summary

Implementation of the proposed residential project would increase the demand for solid waste disposal needs at the project site. However, the Waste-by-Rail program would provide adequate solid waste disposal capacity to serve the proposed project site for the next 100 years. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to landfill capacity; therefore, no mitigation is required.

4.12.3.6 Issue 6 – Energy Consumption

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy Issue 6 Summary

Would implementation of the proposed project require or result in the construction or expansion of electrical or natural gas facilities or result in the wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary use of energy?

Impact: Implementation of the proposed project would construct new on-site electrical and natural gas facilities, the construction of which would result in potential impacts on the environment. Additionally, the proposed project would increase electricity and natural gas usage, but not in a wasteful or inefficient way.

Mitigation: Applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR (air quality, biological resources, cultural resources and greenhouse gas emissions).

Significance Before Mitigation: Significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Standards of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant adverse impact if it would require or result in the construction or expansion of electrical or natural gas facilities which would cause significant environmental impacts or result in the wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary use of energy.

Impact Analysis

Development of the proposed project would result in the consumption of additional energy, including electricity and natural gas. This additional consumption may require the expansion of facilities, as discussed below.

Electricity

As described in Appendix B of this EIR, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, implementation of the proposed project would result in a net increase of approximately one million kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity per year. On-site electrical lines would be connected to the existing SCE electrical lines located within Cataract Avenue. As part of the environmental review for the proposed project, SCE evaluated the proposed project and determined that the anticipated electrical load for the proposed project is already accounted for in the projected load growth for SCE. Therefore, the proposed project site would be adequately served under SCE's existing and planned facilities (SCE 2010).

The construction of on-site electricity facilities to serve the proposed project would have the potential to cause environmental effects to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources and greenhouse gas emissions. Impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would result from construction-related air pollutant emissions. Biological resources would have the potential to be disturbed from the removal of vegetation during construction of electrical facilities, and cultural resources have the potential to be impacted from ground disturbing activities. These environmental impacts are anticipated to be less than significant or would be mitigated to below a level of significance as discussed in the following EIR sections: 4.2 Air Quality, 4.3 Biological Resources, 4.4 Cultural Resources and 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Natural Gas

As described in Appendix B of this EIR, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, implementation of the proposed project would result in a net increase of approximately 50,105 therms of natural gas per year. As part of the environmental review for the proposed project, the Gas Company evaluated the proposed project and determined that the proposed project's natural gas demand would be met by existing facilities, including the existing three-inch gas main located within Cataract Avenue at the intersection of Dalepark Drive (GC 2010). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not require the construction of any new off-site natural gas facilities other than a connection to the existing facility. However, on-site natural gas facilities would be required to serve the proposed residential project, the construction of which would have the potential to cause direct environmental effects to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, and greenhouse gas emissions. Impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would result from construction-related pollutant emissions. Biological resources would have the potential to be disturbed from the removal of vegetation during installation of natural gas lines, and cultural resources have the potential to be impacted from ground-disturbing activities. These environmental impacts are anticipated to be less than significant or would be mitigated to below a level of significance as discussed in the following EIR sections: 4.2 Air Quality, 4.3 Biological Resources, 4.4 Cultural Resources and 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Energy Efficiency

The proposed project would be required to implement design features and mitigation measures to reduce energy consumption. These features and measures are outlined in Section 4.6 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) and include recommended strategies for project construction and operation from the California Climate Action Team, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association and the California Attorney General. Although the proposed project would result in an increase in energy and natural gas consumption, the project would not do so in a wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary manner due to the implementation of energy-reducing design features and mitigation measures identified Section 4.6. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to the wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary usage of energy.

Summary

Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in electricity and natural gas demand, which would require the construction of new on-site facilities which would have a potentially significant impact on the environment.

Implementation of the design features listed in Section 4.6 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) would ensure that the proposed project would not result in a wasteful or inefficient usage of energy. Therefore, impacts associated with energy efficiency would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of applicable mitigation measures in the following sections of this EIR would reduce impacts related to the construction of new energy facilities to a less than significant level: 4.2 Air Quality, 4.3 Biological Resources, 4.4 Cultural Resources, and 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

4.12.4 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy Cumulative Issue Summary

Would implementation of the proposed project have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative utilities, service systems, and energy facility construction impact considering past, present, and probable future projects?

Cumulative Impact	Cumulative Significance	Proposed Project Contribution
Wastewater Treatment: Cumulative development would be required to comply with wastewater treatment requirements.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.
New Water or Wastewater Facilities: Construction of new water or wastewater facilities would undergo environmental review to address impacts to the physical environment.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.
New Storm Water Facilities: Construction of new stormwater facilities would undergo environmental review to address impacts to the physical environment.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.
Water Supply Availability: Water demand for cumulative projects is accounted for in respective water service provider's Urban Water Management Plans.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.
Landfill Capacity: The Waste-by-Rail project will accommodate the County's solid waste disposal needs for the next 100 years.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.
Energy Consumption: Increasing population would increase the demand for energy and energy facilities which would result in adverse physical impacts to the environment.	Significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.

4.12.4.1 Wastewater Treatment

The geographic context for the analysis of wastewater treatment capacity includes the service area for CSMD. Cumulative projects in the CSMD service area, such as the JPI Sevilla Project, Grand Avenue Retail, and the Glendora Station Project, would result in an increase in residential and commercial development that would require wastewater treatment services. An increase in wastewater treatment demand that is disproportionate to wastewater treatment capabilities would result in a violation of the treatment requirements of the Los Angeles RWQCB. However, compliance with regulations such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, California Water Code, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, Water Conservation Projects Act and CEQA would ensure that cumulative impacts related to potential wastewater treatment violations remain below a significant level. Therefore, the baseline cumulative impact is less than significant and the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.12.4.2 New Water or Wastewater Facilities

The geographic context for the analysis of new water or wastewater facilities includes the service area for the following service providers: GSWC, CSMD and CSD. The development of cumulative projects would require the construction of new water and wastewater facilities to serve the proposed projects and expand existing water and wastewater service connections. GSWC, CSMD and CSD maintain master plans that provide long-term planning direction and outline new water or wastewater facilities that may

be required to serve future growth in their service areas. New water and wastewater facilities included in these long-term planning documents have undergone subsequent environmental review to ensure the construction of additional water and wastewater facilities would not result in significant environmental impacts, or to require mitigation measures that would reduce construction-related impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the construction and operation of new water or wastewater facilities to serve cumulative regional demand would be less than significant. Since the baseline cumulative impact is less than significant, the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.12.4.3 New Storm Water Facilities

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts resulting from new storm water facilities is the drainage system downstream of proposed project site. Increased development in the cities of San Dimas and Glendora, including the cumulative projects identified in Table 4.0-2, would result in an increase in impervious surfaces in the area, which could result in higher flow rates and the need for additional storm water facilities to convey these flows. The construction of additional storm water facilities could result in a significant cumulative physical impact to the environment. However, the construction of new storm water facilities would be subject to CEQA review and/or compliance with local, state and federal environmental requirements. Compliance with these regulations would ensure that cumulative impacts related to the construction and operation of new stormwater facilities to serve cumulative regional demand would be less than significant. Therefore, the baseline cumulative impact is less than significant and the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.12.4.4 Water Supply Availability

The geographic context for the analysis of water supply availability includes the service area for GSWC. The construction of cumulative projects would increase the demand for water supply. As required by the Urban Water Management Planning Act, GSWC maintains an UWMP, which provides a strategy to balance water demand with water supply over the next 30 years. As required by law, GSCW updates this document every five years. Cumulative projects within the service area of GSWC are accounted for in the supply and demand projections listed in GSWC's 2005 UWMP, which, as shown in Tables 4.12-1 and 4.12-2, determines that GSCW is able to provide adequate water supply to its service area over the next 30 years. Therefore, cumulative projects are anticipated to have a less than significant impact associated with water supply. Because the baseline cumulative impact is less than significant, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.12.4.5 Landfill Capacity

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts to landfill capacity is the Los Angeles County region. According to CSD, the Waste-by-Rail project would accommodate the solid waste disposal needs of Los Angeles County for the next 100 years (CSD 2010b). Therefore, cumulative projects identified in Table 4.0-2 would result in a less than significant impact related to landfill capacity. Because the baseline cumulative impact is less than significant, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.12.4.6 Energy Consumption

Sources of electricity are diverse and widespread. Electricity and natural gas can be transmitted over long distances, and supply is usually made available from varying and numerous sources. Both electricity and natural gas needed in the region may be generated outside of the state or the country. It is not possible to reasonably predict where the new generation facilities would be located, or to evaluate environmental impacts from the construction and operation of these new facilities. However, should these facilities be proposed in California, the California Energy Commission conducts a complete environmental review of proposed power plant projects 50 megawatts and larger before approving them, and requires as a matter of practice that all significant impacts be mitigated to a less than significant level. Smaller projects must also go through environmental review under the oversight of the local jurisdiction in which they are proposed. Nonetheless it is possible that the construction of future energy projects would result in significant unmitigated impacts. As discussed above in Section 4.12.3.6, Issue 6 – Energy Consumption, the proposed project would increase the demand for natural gas and electric energy, but not at a level that would require the construction of new or expanded generation facilities. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

With regard to the wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary use of energy, California Title 24 provides energy efficiency standards that require project design to minimize energy consumption. Compliance with Title 24 would avoid a cumulative impact related to this topic. In addition, as discussed above, the proposed project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary usage of energy because of the energy efficiency features that would be implemented as part of the project. As such, the proposed project would contribute to the cumulative waste of energy.

4.12.5 Issues With No Potential to Have a Significant Effect on the Environment

Would the proposed project fail to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The proposed project would be served by a city-approved waste disposal service which is required to comply with all applicable solid waste regulations, including recycling; therefore, no further evaluation is necessary.

4.12.6 References

City of San Dimas. 1991. General Plan. September. Accessed on July 26, 2010, available at <http://www.cityofsandimas.com/ps.developmentservices.cfm?ID=2404>

County of Los Angeles Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District (CSD). 2010. About us webpage. Accessed on July 26, 2010, available at http://dpw.lacounty.gov/SMD/SMD/Page_08.cfm

Golden State Water Company (GSWC). 2005. 2005 Urban Water Management Plan – San Dimas. December.

- Golden State Water Company (GSWC). 2010. Written communication from GSWC New Business Manager Alice F. Shiozawa. Correspondence title: Environmental Impact Report of Tentative Tract Map 705839 Brasada Tract) Our New Business Project Estimate # 32600541. Dated July 9, 2010.
- County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSD). 2010a. Written communication from CSD Customer Service Specialist Adriana Raza. Correspondence title: The Proposed Brasada Residential Subdivision Project Site. Dated July 2, 2010.
- County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSD). 2010b. Factsheet: Puente Hills Landfill, Discover How The Latest Technologies are Keeping Neighborhoods Cleaner and Greener. Accessed on June 23, 2010, available at http://www.lacsd.org/education/downloadable_brochures.asp
- Southern California Edison. 2010. Environment webpage. Accessed on June 23, 2010, available at: <http://www.sce.com/AboutSCE/CompanyOverview/territorymap.htm>
- Southern California Edison (SCE). 2010. Written correspondence from SCE Project Manager Jeff J Burt. Correspondence titled: Tr 70583 – Brasada Project Site, San Dimas. Dated June 18, 2010.
- Southern California Gas Company. 2010. Company Profile webpage. Accessed on June 23, 2010, available at <http://www.socalgas.com/aboutus/profile.html>
- Southern California Gas Company (GC). 2010. Written correspondence from Technical Services supervisor Lynn Gerlach. Correspondence titled: Will Serve Letter – Brasada Residential Subdivision Project Site. Dated June 29, 2010.
- Waste Management. 2010. Corporate Profile webpage. Accessed on June 23, 2010, available at http://www.wm.com/wm/about/corporate_profile.asp