

# Chapter 16 PUBLIC SERVICES

## 16.1 Introduction

This chapter describes existing and planned public services and facilities in the Joint Outfall System (JOS) service area. It analyzes potential impacts on existing emergency response, emergency preparedness, and emergency evacuation plans that would result from the implementation of program and project elements, and determines the significance of those impacts.

Public services information was compiled mainly from questionnaires received from the public service providers in the service area. The locations of these providers and their services and planning efforts to accommodate anticipated growth are summarized in Appendix 16-A, which also includes copies of the questionnaires and provider responses.

As discussed in Section 3.6.1, a Preliminary Screening Analysis (Appendix 1-A) was performed to determine impacts associated with the construction and operation of program and project elements by resource area. During preliminary screening, each element was determined to have no impact, a less than significant impact, or a potentially significant impact. Those elements determined to be potentially significant were further analyzed in this environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS). This EIR/EIS analysis discloses the final impact determination for those elements deemed potentially significant in the Preliminary Screening Analysis. The location of the public services impact analysis for each program element is summarized by alternative in Table 16-1.

**Table 16-1. Impact Analysis Location of Program Elements by Alternative**

Program Element	Alternative						Analysis Location	
	1	2	3	4	5 <sup>a</sup>	6 <sup>b</sup>	PSA	EIR/EIS
<b>Conveyance System</b>								
Conveyance Improvements	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	C,O	-
<b>SJCWRP</b>								
Plant Expansion	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	C,O	C
Process Optimization	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	C,O	C
WRP Effluent Management	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	O	-
<b>POWRP</b>								
Process Optimization	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	C,O	C
WRP Effluent Management	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	O	-
<b>LCWRP</b>								
Process Optimization	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	C,O	C
WRP Effluent Management	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	O	-
<b>LBWRP</b>								
Process Optimization	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	C,O	C
WRP Effluent Management	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	O	-

**Table 16-1 (Continued)**

Program Element	Alternative						Analysis Location	
	1	2	3	4	5 <sup>a</sup>	6 <sup>b</sup>	PSA	EIR/EIS
<b>WNWRP</b>								
WRP Effluent Management	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	O	-
<b>JWPCP</b>								
Solids Processing	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	C,O	C
Biosolids Management	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	O	-
JWPCP Effluent Management	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	Evaluated at the project level. See Table 16-2.	
WRP effluent management and biosolids management do not include construction.								
<sup>a</sup> See Section 16.4.7 for a discussion of the No-Project Alternative.								
<sup>b</sup> See Section 16.4.8 for a discussion of the No-Federal-Action Alternative.								
PSA = Preliminary Screening Analysis								
C = construction								
O = operation								
N/A = not applicable								

As discussed in Section 3.2.2, Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) effluent management was the one program element that was carried forward as a project. The location of the public services impact analysis for each project element is summarized by alternative in Table 16-2.

**Table 16-2. Impact Analysis Location of Project Elements by Alternative**

Project Element	Alternative						Analysis Location	
	1	2	3	4	5 <sup>a</sup>	6 <sup>b</sup>	PSA	EIR/EIS
<b>Tunnel Alignment</b>								
Wilmington to SP Shelf (onshore)	X				N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Wilmington to SP Shelf (offshore)	X				N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Wilmington to PV Shelf (onshore)		X			N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Wilmington to PV Shelf (offshore)		X			N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf (onshore)			X		N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf (offshore)			X		N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Figueroa/Western to Royal Palms (onshore)				X	N/A	N/A	C,O	C
<b>Shaft Sites</b>								
JWPCP East	X	X			N/A	N/A	C,O	C
JWPCP West			X	X	N/A	N/A	C,O	C
TraPac	X	X			N/A	N/A	C,O	C
LAXT	X	X			N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Southwest Marine	X	X			N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Angels Gate			X		N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Royal Palms				X	N/A	N/A	C,O	C
<b>Riser/Diffuser Areas</b>								
SP Shelf	X				N/A	N/A	C,O	C
PV Shelf		X	X		N/A	N/A	C,O	C
Existing Ocean Outfalls	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	C,O	C

**Table 16-2 (Continued)**

Project Element	Alternative						Analysis Location	
	1	2	3	4	5 <sup>a</sup>	6 <sup>b</sup>	PSA	EIR/EIS
<sup>a</sup> See Section 16.4.7 for a discussion of the No-Project Alternative.								
<sup>b</sup> See Section 16.4.8 for a discussion of the No-Federal-Action Alternative.								
PSA = Preliminary Screening Analysis								
C = construction								
O = operation								
N/A = not applicable								

Other services analyzed in this EIR/EIS are utilities (Chapter 20), recreation (Chapter 17), marine transportation (Chapter 19), and handling and transport of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes (Chapter 10). A discussion of schools is not provided in this chapter because program and project elements would have no impact on schools or school districts. For additional information regarding schools, refer to the Preliminary Screening Analysis (Appendix 1-A) and Appendix 16-A.

## 16.2 Environmental Setting

### 16.2.1 Regional Setting

For the Clearwater Program, the regional setting spans the central, southern, and eastern portions of Los Angeles County. Emergency response and preparedness providers for these areas are listed below and summarized in Appendix 16-A. These fire and police agencies are discussed because of their role in implementing emergency response, preparedness, and/or evacuation plans and procedures.

- Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
- Los Angeles Police Department
- Los Angeles Port Police
- Long Beach Police Department
- Pomona Police Department
- Los Angeles County Fire Department
- Los Angeles Fire Department
- Long Beach Fire Department
- United States Coast Guard (USCG)

### 16.2.2 Program Setting

The program elements are located within multiple jurisdictions of public service providers for emergency and security, as summarized in Table 16-3.

**Table 16-3. Emergency and Security Public Service Providers (Program)**

<b>Program Element Location</b>	<b>Fire Service Provider</b>	<b>Security/Police Service Provider</b>
SJCWRP	Los Angeles County Fire Department	Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department
POWRP	Los Angeles County Fire Department	Pomona Police Department
LCWRP	Los Angeles County Fire Department	Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department
LBWRP	Long Beach Fire Department	Long Beach Police Department
WNWRP	Los Angeles County Fire Department	El Monte Police Department
JWPCP	(Discussed under Project Setting)	

### **San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant**

The Industry Station of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department provides primary service to the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant (SJCWRP). The station is located at 150 North Hudson Avenue in the City of Industry, approximately 3.6 miles from the plant. The SJCWRP is also located within an unspecified beat/patrol area, and the estimated emergency response time is approximately 10 minutes. (Tse pers. comm.)

Fire Stations 87 and 90 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department are the jurisdictional primary responding stations for the SJCWRP. The stations are located at 140 South Second Avenue in the City of Industry, approximately 2.5 miles from the plant, and at 10115 East Rush Street in the city of South El Monte, approximately 2.3 miles from the plant, respectively. Fire Station 87 is staffed with a four-person engine company, and Fire Station 90 is staffed with a three-person engine company and a two-person paramedic squad. Fire Station 87 is also a secondary responding station, as is Fire Station 168, which is located at 3207 Cogswell Road in the city of El Monte and is staffed with a three-person engine company.<sup>1</sup> The Los Angeles County Fire Department uses national guidelines of a 5-minute response time for the first arriving unit for fire and emergency medical services (EMS) and 8 minutes for the advanced life support unit in urban areas. (Todd pers. comm.)

### **Pomona Water Reclamation Plant**

The Main Station of the Pomona Police Department provides primary service to the Pomona Water Reclamation Plant (POWRP). The station is located at 490 West Mission Boulevard in the city of Pomona, approximately 2.4 miles from the plant. The POWRP is also located within an unspecified beat/patrol area. The Pomona Police Department operates at a 0.9 officer per 1,000 population ratio, and the estimated emergency response time to the plant is less than 4 minutes. (Wright pers. comm.)

Fire Station 184 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department is the jurisdictional primary responding station for the POWRP. It is located at 1980 West Orange Grove in the city of Pomona, approximately 0.85 mile from the plant and is staffed with a three-person engine company. Fire Station 187 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department is the secondary responding station and is located at 3325 Temple Avenue in the city of Pomona, approximately 1.9 miles from the POWRP. It is staffed with a four-person combination engine/ladder truck apparatus. The estimated response times to the plant comply with national guidelines of 5 minutes for the first arriving unit for fire and EMS and 8 minutes for the advanced life support unit. (Todd pers. comm.)

### **Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant**

The Cerritos Station of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department provides primary service to the Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant (LCWRP). The station is located at 18135 Bloomfield Avenue in the

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this chapter, secondary station(s) is assumed to be another station that could respond to a specific location if the closest station (considered the primary station) cannot respond.

city of Cerritos, approximately 4 miles from the plant. The LCWRP is also located within an unspecified beat/patrol area, and the estimated emergency response time to the plant is approximately 3.6 minutes. (Tse pers. comm.)

Fire Station 115 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department is the jurisdictional primary responding station for the LCWRP. It is located at 11317 Alondra Boulevard in the city of Norwalk, approximately 1.2 miles from the plant. It is staffed with two four-person engine companies. Fire Station 98 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department is the secondary responding station and is located at 9814 Maplewood Avenue in the city of Bellflower, approximately 2.3 miles from the LCWRP. It is staffed with a three-person engine company and a two-person paramedic squad. Estimated response times to the plant comply with national guidelines of 5-minutes for the first arriving unit for fire and EMS and 8 minutes for the advanced life support unit. (Todd pers. comm.)

### **Long Beach Water Reclamation Plant**

The East Division of the Long Beach Police Department provides primary service to the Long Beach Water Reclamation Plant (LBWRP). It is located at 4800 Los Coyotes Diagonal in the city of Long Beach, approximately 4.4 miles from the plant. The LBWRP is also located in beat/patrol area 18, which is staffed with a minimum of one police officer for every watch to ensure 24-hour police coverage. It is the Long Beach Police Department's goal to respond to emergency and Priority 1 calls in 5 minutes or less. (Levy pers. comm.)

Fire Station 5 of the Long Beach Fire Department is the jurisdictional primary responding station for the LBWRP. The station is located at 7575 East Wardlow Road in the city of Long Beach, approximately 3.2 miles from the plant. It is staffed with a four-person engine company. The average unit response time is between approximately 5 minutes and 8 minutes. Fire Station 18 of the Long Beach Fire Department is the secondary responding station and is located at 3361 Palo Verde Avenue in the city of Long Beach, approximately 3.2 miles from the LBWRP. It is staffed with a four-person engine company. The average unit response time is approximately 7 minutes. (Portolan pers. comm.)

### **Joint Water Pollution Control Plant**

The Carson Station of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department provides primary service to the JWPCP. The station is located at 21356 South Avalon Boulevard in the city of Carson, approximately 2 miles from the plant. The JWPCP is also located within an unspecified beat/patrol area, and the estimated emergency response time is almost immediate. (Tse pers. comm.)

Fire Station 36 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department is the jurisdictional primary responding station for the JWPCP. It is located at 127 West 223<sup>rd</sup> Street in the city of Carson, approximately 2.3 miles from the plant. Fire Station 36 is staffed with two 4-person engine companies and a 2-person paramedic squad. Fire Station 127 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department is the secondary responding station and is located at 2049 223<sup>rd</sup> Street in the city of Carson, approximately 3.6 miles from the plant. Fire Station 127 is staffed with a 6-person light force. Estimated response times to the JWPCP comply with national guidelines of 5-minutes for the first arriving unit for fire and EMS and 8 minutes for the advanced life support unit. (Todd pers. comm.)

## **16.2.3 Project Setting**

The project elements are located within multiple jurisdictions of public service providers for emergency and security, as summarized in Table 16-4.

**Table 16-4. Emergency and Security Public Service Providers (Project)**

<b>Project Element</b>	<b>Fire Service Provider</b>	<b>Security/Police Service Provider</b>
<b>Tunnel Alignment</b>		
Wilmington to SP Shelf	Los Angeles County Fire Department Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department Los Angeles Port Police USCG
Wilmington to PV Shelf	Los Angeles County Fire Department Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department Los Angeles Port Police USCG
Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf	Los Angeles County Fire Department Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department Los Angeles Police Department
Figueroa/Western to Royal Palms	Los Angeles County Fire Department Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department Los Angeles Police Department
<b>Shaft Site</b>		
JWPCP East	Los Angeles County Fire Department	Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department
JWPCP West	Los Angeles County Fire Department Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department
TraPac	Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles Port Police
LAXT	Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles Port Police
Southwest Marine	Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles Port Police
Angels Gate	Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles Police Department
Royal Palms	Los Angeles Fire Department	Los Angeles Police Department
<b>Riser/Diffuser Area</b>		
SP Shelf	N/A	USCG
PV Shelf	N/A	USCG
Existing Ocean Outfalls	N/A	USCG
N/A = not applicable		

### 16.2.3.1 Tunnel Alignment

The tunnel alignments would extend through multiple police and fire jurisdictions. These are identified in Table 16-4. Access to the tunnels could only be gained via the shaft sites; therefore, public service providers for the shaft sites would also service the tunnel alignments and are described in the following section.

### 16.2.3.2 Shaft Site

#### JWPCP East

The Carson Station of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would provide primary service to the JWPCP East shaft site. The station is located at 21356 South Avalon Boulevard in the city of Carson, approximately 3 miles from the shaft site. The shaft site is also located within an unspecified beat/patrol area, and the estimated emergency response time would be almost immediate. (Tse pers. comm.)

Fire Station 36 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department would be the jurisdictional primary responding station for the JWPCP East shaft site. The station is located at 127 West 223<sup>rd</sup> Street in the city of Carson, approximately 1.8 miles from the shaft site. The station is staffed with two four-person engine companies and a two-person paramedic squad. Fire Station 127 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department would be the secondary responding station and is located at 2049 East 223<sup>rd</sup> Street in the city of Carson, approximately 3.6 miles from the shaft site. It is staffed with a six-person light force. The

estimated response times to the shaft site would comply with national guidelines of 5 minutes for the first arriving unit for fire and EMS and 8 minutes for the advanced life support unit. (Todd pers. comm.)

### **JWPCP West**

The Carson Station of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would provide primary service to the JWPCP West shaft site. The station is located at 21356 South Avalon Boulevard in the city of Carson, approximately 3 miles from the shaft site. The shaft site is also located within an unspecified beat/patrol area, and the estimated emergency response time would be almost immediate. (Tse pers. comm.)

There would be two primary jurisdictional responding fire stations for the JWPCP West shaft site. Fire Station 36 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department would be the first primary responding station for the JWPCP West shaft site north of Lomita Boulevard. The station is located at 127 West 223<sup>rd</sup> Street in the city of Carson, approximately 2.3 miles from the shaft site. It is staffed with two four-person engine companies and a two-person paramedic squad. Fire Station 127 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department would be the secondary responding station for the JWPCP West shaft site north of Lomita Boulevard. The station is located at 2049 East 223<sup>rd</sup> Street in the city of Carson, approximately 3.6 miles from the shaft site. It is staffed with a six-person light force. The estimated response times to the shaft site would comply with national guidelines of 5 minutes for the first arriving unit for fire and EMS and 8 minutes for the advanced life support unit. (Todd pers. comm.)

Fire Station 85 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be the second primary responding station for the JWPCP West shaft site south of Lomita Boulevard. The station is located at 1331 West 253<sup>rd</sup> Street in Harbor City, approximately 1.2 miles from the shaft site. It consists of an urban search and rescue vehicle, a truck, two engines, and a rescue ambulance, and has a total of 12 members. Fire Station 38 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be the secondary responding station for the JWPCP West shaft site south of Lomita Boulevard. The station is located at 124 East I Street in the community of Wilmington, approximately 2.4 miles from the shaft site. It consists of a truck, two engine companies, basic life support, a rescue ambulance, and advanced life support. The estimated emergency response time for service to the shaft site would be approximately 4 to 6 minutes. (Fry pers. comm.; Herrera pers. comm. 2010b.)

### **TraPac**

The Main Station of the Los Angeles Port Police would provide primary service to the Trans Pacific Container Service Corporation (TraPac) shaft site. The station is located at 425 South Palos Verdes Street in the community of San Pedro, approximately 3.1 miles from the shaft site. The shaft site is also located within an unspecified beat/patrol area. The estimated emergency response time to the shaft site would be 3 minutes. (Provinchain pers. comm. 2010a.)

Fire Station 38 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be the jurisdictional primary responding station for the TraPac shaft site. Fire Station 38 is located at 124 East I Street in the community of Wilmington, approximately 1.4 miles from the shaft site. It consists of a truck, two engine companies, basic life support, a rescue ambulance, and advanced life support. Fire Stations 48 and 85 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would respond to this site as well. Fire Station 48 is located at 1601 South Grand Avenue in the community of San Pedro, approximately 3.9 miles from the shaft site. It houses a hazardous materials taskforce, which consists of a hazardous materials squad, the taskforce, and a rescue ambulance squad, and has a total of 16 members. Fire Station 85 is located at 1331 West 253<sup>rd</sup> Street in Harbor City, approximately 3 miles from the shaft site. It consists of an urban search and rescue vehicle, a truck, two engines, and a rescue ambulance, and has a total of 12 members. Fire Stations 36 and 49 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be the secondary responding stations. Fire Station 36 is located at 1005 North Gaffey Street in the community of San Pedro, approximately 2.2 miles from the shaft site.

It has one engine, one paramedic rescue ambulance, one foam carrier, and one reserve suburban battalion. Fire Station 49 is located at 400 Yacht Street, Berth 194 in the Port of Los Angeles, approximately 1.3 miles from the shaft site. It has two fire boats, one engine, one EMT rescue ambulance, and one battalion chief suburban. The estimated emergency response time for service to the shaft site would be approximately 4 to 6 minutes. (Herrera pers. comm. 2010a, 2010b; Fry pers. comm.; LAFD 2010a, 2010b.)

## **LAXT**

The Main Station of the Los Angeles Port Police would provide primary service to the Los Angeles Export Terminal (LAXT) shaft site. The station is located at 425 South Palos Verdes Street in the community of San Pedro, approximately 3.2 miles from the shaft site. The shaft site is also located within an unspecified beat/patrol area. The estimated emergency response time to the shaft site would be 3 minutes. (Provinchain pers. comm. 2010a.)

Fire Station 40 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be the jurisdictional primary responding station for the LAXT shaft site. Fire Station 40 is located at 330 Ferry Street in the Port of Los Angeles, less than 1 mile from the shaft site. It is equipped with a single engine company, basic life support, and an ambulance. Fire Stations 48 and 85 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would respond to this site as well. Fire Station 48 is located at 1601 South Grand Avenue in the community of San Pedro, approximately 4.5 miles from the shaft site. It consists of an urban search and rescue vehicle, a truck, two engines, and a rescue ambulance, and has a total of 12 members. Fire Station 85 is located at 1331 West 253<sup>rd</sup> Street in Harbor City, approximately 6.3 miles from the shaft site. It consists of an urban search and rescue vehicle, a truck, two engines, and a rescue ambulance, and has a total of 12 members. Fire Stations 38 and 49 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be the secondary responding stations. Fire Station 38 is located at 124 East I Street in the community of Wilmington, approximately 6.5 miles from the shaft site. Fire Station 49 is located at 400 Yacht Street, Berth 194 in the Port of Los Angeles, approximately 5.6 miles from the shaft site. The estimated emergency response time to the shaft site from these various stations would be approximately 4 to 6 minutes. (Herrera pers. comm. 2010a, 2010b; Fry pers. comm.; LAFD 2010a, 2010b.)

## **Southwest Marine**

The Main Station of the Los Angeles Port Police would provide primary service to the Southwest Marine shaft site. It is located at 425 South Palos Verdes Street in the community of San Pedro, approximately 4.7 miles from the shaft site. The shaft site property is controlled by the Port of Los Angeles for use in movie and filming activities. Therefore, the Los Angeles Port Police would provide access and security to this shaft site during filming operations. The shaft site is located within an unspecified beat/patrol area. The estimated emergency response time to the shaft site would be 3 minutes. (Provinchain pers. comm. 2010a.)

Fire Station 40 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be the jurisdictional primary responding station for the Southwest Marine shaft site. Fire Station 40 is located at 330 Ferry Street in the Port of Los Angeles, approximately 1.7 miles from the shaft site. It is equipped with a single engine company, basic life support, and an ambulance. Fire Stations 48 and 85 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would respond to this site as well. Fire Station 48 is located at 1601 South Grand Avenue in the community of San Pedro, approximately 5.9 miles from the shaft site. It houses a hazardous materials taskforce, which consists of a hazardous materials squad, the taskforce, and a rescue ambulance, and has a total of 16 members. Fire Station 85 is located at 1331 West 253<sup>rd</sup> Street in Harbor City, approximately 8.7 miles from the shaft site. It consists of an urban search and rescue vehicle, a truck, two engines, and a rescue ambulance, and has a total of 12 members. Fire Stations 38 and 49 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be the secondary responding stations. Fire Station 38 is located at 124 East I Street in the



community of Wilmington, approximately 6.2 miles from the shaft site. Fire Station 49 is located at 400 Yacht Street, Berth 194 in the Port of Los Angeles, approximately 7.0 miles from the shaft site. The estimated emergency response time for service to the shaft site would be approximately 4 to 6 minutes. (Herrera pers. comm. 2010a, 2010b; Fry pers. comm.; LAFD 2010a, 2010b.)

### **Angels Gate and Royal Palms**

The Angels Gate and Royal Palms shaft sites are within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Police Department, which did not provide the requested information regarding the primary response station and response time. It was assumed that the primary response station would be the Harbor Community Police Station located at 2175 John S. Gibson Boulevard, approximately 3.8 and 4.8 miles from the shaft sites, respectively.

Fire Station 48 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be the jurisdictional primary responding station for the Angels Gate and Royal Palms shaft sites. Fire Station 48 is located at 1601 South Grand Avenue in the community of San Pedro, approximately 1.7 miles from the Angels Gate shaft site and 2.7 miles from the Royal Palms shaft site. It houses a hazardous materials taskforce, which consists of a hazardous materials squad, the taskforce, and a rescue ambulance squad, and has a total of 16 members. Fire Station 101 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would respond to these sites as well. The station is located at 1414 25<sup>th</sup> Street in the community of San Pedro, approximately 1.6 miles from the Angels Gate shaft site and 0.6 miles from the Royal Palms shaft site. It is equipped with a single four-person engine company and two-person rescue ambulance. The estimated response time for service to these shaft sites would be approximately 4 to 6 minutes. (Herrera pers. comm. 2010c; Fry pers. comm.; LAFD 2010a.)

Fire Stations 36, 85, and 112 of the Los Angeles Fire Department would be secondary responding stations. Fire Station 36 is located at 1005 North Gaffey Street in the community of San Pedro, approximately 3.2 miles from the Angels Gate shaft site and 4.9 miles from the Royal Palms shaft site. It is equipped with a single four-person engine company. Fire Station 85 is located at 1331 West 253<sup>rd</sup> Street in Harbor City, approximately 7.4 miles from the Angels Gate shaft site and 9.2 miles from the Royal Palms shaft site. It consists of an urban search and rescue vehicle, a truck, two engines, and a rescue ambulance, and has a total of 12 members. Fire Station 112 is located at 444 South Harbor Boulevard, Berth 86 in the Port of Los Angeles, approximately 3.2 miles from the Angels Gate shaft site and 4.6 miles from the Royal Palms shaft site. It is equipped with a single four-person engine company. The estimated response time for service to these shaft sites would be approximately 4 to 6 minutes. (Herrera pers. comm. 2010c; Fry pers. comm.; LAFD 2010a.)

#### **16.2.3.3 Riser/Diffuser Area**

Maritime safety, law enforcement, and emergency response would be provided by the USCG for the riser and diffuser area on the San Pedro Shelf (SP Shelf) and the Palos Verdes Shelf (PV Shelf), and for the existing ocean outfalls.

## **16.3 Regulatory Setting**

### **16.3.1 Federal**

#### **16.3.1.1 Maritime Transportation Security Act**

The Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) and its international equivalent, the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code (adopted by the International Maritime Organization), require port authorities and facility operators to designate and train company, vessel, and facility security officers and

develop security plans for facilities and vessels based on security assessments and surveys. MTSAs regulations also guide implementation of security measures specific to the operations of each facility and compliance with maritime security levels. Regulations regarding the submittal of security plans became effective December 31, 2003; operational compliance was mandated by July 1, 2004.

### **16.3.1.2 Occupational Safety and Health Administration**

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has prepared a number of guidance documents, including the underground construction regulations found in 29 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 1926, Section 800. The underground construction regulation applies to the construction of underground tunnels, shafts, chambers, and passageways. Hazards include reduced natural ventilation and light, difficult and limited access and egress, exposure to air contaminants, fire, flooding, and explosion. A sample of items covered by the OSHA standards includes requirements for safe access and egress routes, employee training in hazard recognition, a “check-in/check-out” procedure, and emergency procedures. All employees involved in underground construction must be trained to recognize and respond to hazards associated with tunneling work. (OSHA 2003.)

A confined space entry program is a requirement of 29 CFR Part 1910. A confined space means a space that is large enough and so configured that an employee can physically enter and perform work; has limited or restricted means for entry or exit; and is not designed for continuous employee occupancy. Implementation of a written permit space program is required when an employer decides that its employees will enter permit-required spaces.

## **16.3.2 State and Regional**

### **16.3.2.1 California Occupational Safety and Health Administration**

#### **Tunnel Safety Orders**

The Tunnel Safety Orders of the 8 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Subchapter 20 establishes minimum safety standards in places of employment at tunnels, shafts, raises, inclines, and underground chambers. A sample of items covered includes safety precautions, first aid, emergency plan and precautions, rescue apparatus, and fire prevention and control.

## **16.3.3 Local**

### **16.3.3.1 City of Los Angeles General Plan**

#### **Fire Protection and Prevention Plan**

Fire prevention, fire protection, and emergency medical services in the city of Los Angeles are operated under the Fire Protection and Prevention Plan, an element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, and the Fire Code section of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. The fire protection and prevention plan serves as a guide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of fire protection facilities in the city (City of Los Angeles 1995). The plan sets forth policies and standards for fire station distribution and location, fire suppression water-flow (or fire flow), fire hydrant standards and locations, firefighting equipment access, emergency ambulance services, and fire prevention activities. The Los Angeles Fire Department also considers population, density, nature of onsite land uses, and traffic flow in evaluating the adequacy of fire protection services for a specific area or land use.

### **16.3.3.2 Los Angeles County General Plan**

The Safety Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan serves as a long-range emergency response plan. It seeks to reduce future losses of life, injuries, and socioeconomic disruption by design of safer environments and facilities, avoidance of hazardous sites, removal or strengthening of unsafe structures, and promotion of preparedness for emergencies.

### **16.3.3.3 Port of Los Angeles Port Master Plan**

#### **Harbor Fire Protection Master Plan**

The Harbor Fire Protection Master Plan is a joint program to develop goals and objectives for a fire protection plan for the harbor area, which encompasses not only the harbor district, but also the surrounding communities of San Pedro and Wilmington. Due to security sensitive information, the Harbor Fire Protection Master Plan is not available to the public.

### **16.3.3.4 Long Beach General Plan**

Hazardous fire conditions are controlled via the permit issuance program and the business licenses approval required by the Long Beach Fire Prevention Bureau. Special permits are required for most hazardous materials and processes, and all business license applications must be filed annually and approved by the fire prevention bureau.

The city of Long Beach and its facilities are fairly well protected by city codes and standards. The city has adopted the 1971 edition of the Uniform Fire Code with additions. A 1970 edition of the Uniform Building Code has been adopted by the city with a number of amendments and additions. According to the insurance services office standards, the building code provisions are comprehensive, but are somewhat inadequate in areas pertaining to allowable areas, thickness of walls, and fire-resistance construction.

### **16.3.3.5 Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans**

#### **City of Los Angeles**

The city of Los Angeles and its various public service providers and departments are responsible for managing any emergency related to city and Port of Los Angeles operations, including the communities of San Pedro and Wilmington, depending on the severity of the emergency. The City of Los Angeles Emergency Management Department (EMD) coordinates the emergency preparedness and planning of all city departments, over 4 million residents, and over 400,000 businesses residing within the city's 475 square miles. During major emergencies and disasters, the EMD coordinates the response, mitigation, and recovery efforts (City of Los Angeles EMD 2010). The EMD has prepared the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures that describes the organization, responsibilities, and priorities of all city departments and local agencies in case of an emergency (City of Los Angeles EMD 2006). The manual is maintained by the EMD and is organized by type of emergency as well as by the city departments that are responsible for responding to certain emergencies. The manual includes the following sections applicable to the Port of Los Angeles and other city locations:

- Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD) Plan
- Hazardous Materials Annex
- Tsunami Response Plan Annex
- Major Fire Annex

These documents contain information regarding the chain of command and the general organization of any response to a major emergency event. They also include an emergency checklist for the Los Angeles Fire Department and other departments, such as the LAHD, and identify the respective division that is responsible for carrying out the action items. (City of Los Angeles EMD 1993.) Specifically, the LAHD Plan of the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Organization Manual identifies very general initial policies and procedures for the LAHD in the event of any emergency.

The hazardous materials annex contains information regarding the chain of command and the general organization of any response to a hazardous material release anywhere in the city, including the Port of Los Angeles area (City of Los Angeles EMD 1993). It includes an emergency checklist for the LAHD to follow should a hazardous materials release occur within the port area. The checklist identifies specific pre-event, response, and recovery action items and identifies the respective LAHD divisions (i.e., Port Police) that are responsible for carrying out the action items.

The tsunami response plan annex identifies the Port of Los Angeles area as a tsunami inundation zone and outlines policies and procedures of nine different city departments (including the LAHD, the Los Angeles Police Department, the Los Angeles Fire Department, and the EMD) in event of a tsunami (City of Los Angeles EMD 2008). The plan identifies evacuation routes for the San Pedro and harbor areas and specifies evacuation locations. According to the plan, the mission of the LAHD with respect to a tsunami is to provide employees, tenants, and the public with a safe, well-planned, and organized method of evacuating the Port of Los Angeles area. The plan outlines several actions for which the Los Angeles Port Police are responsible, including following the established evacuation checklist, evacuating the affected tsunami inundation zone, and activating notification procedures. The divisional organization and basic functions that would support the tsunami response plan for the port area are consistent with the emergency plan and procedures of the LAHD.

## County of Los Angeles

The Office of Emergency Management (OEM) was established by Chapter 2.68 of the Los Angeles County Code with responsibility for organizing and directing the preparedness efforts of the emergency management organization of the county. The OEM is the day-to-day Los Angeles County operational area coordinator for the entire geographic area of the county, and its responsibilities include:

- Maintaining an approved operational area emergency response plan
- Providing ongoing leadership and coordinating disaster plans and exercises with the 88 cities, 137 unincorporated communities, and 288 special districts in the county
- Maintaining the Los Angeles County Emergency Operations Center in a state of operational readiness, in partnership with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Emergency Operations Bureau
- Serving as an on-call county emergency operations center first responder on a 24-hour basis
- Providing an OEM duty officer on a 24-hour basis to address inquiries and concerns from county, local, and state officials regarding potential or escalating emergency conditions (County of Los Angeles OEM 2010)

The Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (County of Los Angeles 1998) outlines the planned response of the county operational area to emergencies associated with natural and man-made disasters and technological incidents. Cities and unincorporated areas in the Los Angeles County Operational Area include Pomona, Carson, Cerritos, Whittier, and Long Beach (County of Los Angeles OEM 2009).

## Port of Los Angeles

The LAHD maintains emergency response and evacuation plans. The Homeland Security Division of the LAHD is responsible for maintaining and implementing the LAHD's Emergency Procedures Plan. This plan was last revised in January 2010. The LAHD's Emergency Procedures Plan references its evacuation plan. The evacuation plan is maintained and implemented by the Los Angeles Port Police and in consultation with the Homeland Security Division and the USCG. The LAHD's evacuation plan was also updated in January 2010. (Provinchain pers. comm. 2010b.)

## City of Carson

The city of Carson has prepared a multi-hazard functional plan for emergency response within the city. The plan meets the state of California's Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) requirements. The city also complies with the Los Angeles County Emergency Management Plan.

Threats and emergency response are thoroughly described and outlined in the SEMS Multi-Hazard Functional Plan. Key points of the plan include the identification of critical areas in the city that represent dangers, as well as communications, areas for meeting and staging in an emergency event, and emergency evacuation.

The plan also identifies emergency routes. The city has four major freeways (I-405, SR-91, I-110, and I-710) that would serve as potential evacuation routes during a disaster. Arterial streets with right-of-way widths from 80 to 100 feet form a grid pattern throughout the city at 0.5-mile intervals. East-west arterial streets that would be used as evacuation routes include Lomita Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, 223<sup>rd</sup> Street, Carson Street, Del Amo Boulevard, Victoria Street, Artesia Boulevard, and Alondra Boulevard. North-south arterial streets include Santa Fe Avenue, Alameda Street, Wilmington Avenue, Avalon Boulevard, Main Street, Figueroa Street, and Broadway.

## City of Cerritos

The city of Cerritos has prepared a multi-hazard functional plan for emergency response within the city. The plan meets the state of California's SEMS requirements. The city also complies with the Los Angeles County Emergency Management Plan.

Emergency response and threats are thoroughly described and outlined in the multi-hazard functional plan. Key points of the plan include the identification of critical areas in the city that represent dangers, as well as communications, areas for meeting and staging in an emergency event, and emergency evacuation.

The plan also includes resources and information to assist city residents, public and private sector organizations, and others interested in participating in planning for natural hazards. The mitigation plan provides a list of activities that could assist the city in reducing risk and preventing loss from future natural hazard events. The action items address multi-hazard issues, as well as activities for earthquakes, flooding, and windstorms.

Goals for emergency services include:

- Establishing policy to ensure mitigation projects for critical facilities, services, and infrastructure
- Strengthening emergency operations by increasing collaboration and coordination among public agencies, non-profit organizations, business, and industry
- Coordinating and integrating natural hazard mitigation activities, where appropriate, with emergency operations plans and procedures

## United States Coast Guard

Most USCG emergency response and management plans are internal or contain sensitive security information (Hennigan pers. comm. 2010a); therefore, none were available for analysis.

## 16.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### 16.4.1 Methodology and Assumptions

The program and project elements were evaluated to determine if they would interfere or conflict with the implementation of any emergency response plans, emergency preparedness plans, or evacuation plans. Public services for the program and project elements were assessed regarding their ability to handle potential physical environmental effects caused by construction activities that could interfere with the implementation of emergency response plans, emergency preparedness plans, and evacuation plans.

All public service agencies were contacted to obtain information regarding their existing and projected service capacity, as well as projected impacts that would result from implementation of the program and project elements. Responses were received from all agencies with the exception of the Los Angeles Police Department. In the absence of a response, Los Angeles Police Department services were considered in all analyses and determinations for project and program elements under the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Police Department. A summary of which providers were contacted, when they were contacted, and when they responded is shown in Table 16-5. For more information regarding their responses, please see the provider responses in Appendix 16-A.

**Table 16-5. Public Service Providers**

Provider	Contact Date	Response Date
ABC Unified School District	February 17, 2010	March 9, 2010
Los Angeles County Fire Department	February 18, 2010	March 5, 2010
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department	February 17, 2010	March 12, 2010
Los Angeles Port Police	February 18, 2010	March 8, 2010
Los Angeles Unified School District	February 17, 2010	August 19, 2010
Long Beach Unified School District	February 17, 2010	March 16, 2010
Long Beach Fire Department	February 18, 2010	March 10, 2010
Long Beach Police Department	February 17, 2010	March 11, 2010
Los Angeles Fire Department	February 18, 2010	March 26, 2010
Los Angeles Police Department	February 17, 2010	No response
Pomona Police Department	February 17, 2010	March 4, 2010
Pomona Unified School District	February 17, 2010	March 4, 2010
United States Coast Guard	February 18, 2010	March 5, 2010
Whittier City School District	February 17, 2010	March 10, 2010

#### 16.4.1.1 Baseline

##### CEQA Baseline

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) baseline is the existing public services that would be provided at the locations where program and project elements would be constructed and operated.

## NEPA No-Federal-Action Baseline

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) no-federal-action baseline for the Clearwater Program is described in Section 1.7.4.2. The NEPA baseline in general represents the condition of resources at the year 2022 when construction of project elements under the United States (U.S.) Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps') jurisdiction would conclude.

Existing coverage and level of public services are expected to remain in a comparable state through the completion of construction in 2022. As a result, the NEPA no-federal-action baseline is the same as the CEQA baseline.

Note that the NEPA analysis includes direct and indirect impacts as discussed in Section 3.5.2. Any impact associated with project elements located within the Corps' geographic jurisdiction (i.e., the marine environment) during construction would be the direct result of the Corps permit and considered a direct impact under NEPA. Any impact associated with project elements located outside the Corps' geographic jurisdiction during construction would be the indirect result of the Corps permit and considered an indirect impact under NEPA. Any impact that occurs during operation would be considered an indirect impact under NEPA.

### 16.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

The program and/or project would pose a significant impact if it exceeds any of the following thresholds for public services (PS):

PS-1. Requires the substantial expansion of existing fire protection facilities or the construction of new fire protection facilities to maintain an acceptable level of service.

PS-2. Requires the substantial expansion of existing police service facilities or the construction of new police service facilities to maintain an acceptable level of service.

PS-3. Requires the substantial expansion of existing school facilities or requires the building of new facilities.

PS-4. Requires the substantial expansion of existing parks and/or recreation opportunities or requires the building of new recreation facilities.

PS-5. Impairs implementation of or physically interferes with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or requires the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan.

Program and project elements were analyzed by threshold in the Preliminary Screening Analysis (Appendix 1-A) to identify potentially significant impacts on public services before mitigation. Table 16-6 identifies which elements were brought forward for further analysis by threshold in this EIR/EIS for Alternatives 1 through 4. If applicable, Table 16-6 also identifies thresholds evaluated in this EIR/EIS if an emergency discharge into various water courses were to occur under the No-Project or No-Federal Action Alternatives, as described in Sections 3.4.1.5 and 3.4.1.6.

**Table 16-6. Thresholds Evaluated**

	Alt.	Threshold				
		PS-1	PS-2	PS-3	PS-4	PS-5
<b>Program Element</b>						
SJCWRP Plant Expansion	1-5					X
SJCWRP Process Optimization	1-4					X
POWRP Process Optimization	1-4					X
LCWRP Process Optimization	1-4					X
LBWRP Process Optimization	1-4					X
JWPCP Solids Processing	1-5					X
<b>Project Element</b>						
Wilmington to SP Shelf (onshore tunnel) <sup>a</sup>	1,2					X
Wilmington to SP Shelf (offshore tunnel)	1					X
Wilmington to PV Shelf (onshore tunnel) <sup>a</sup>	1,2					X
Wilmington to PV Shelf (offshore tunnel)	2					X
Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf (onshore tunnel)	3					X
Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf (offshore tunnel)	3					X
Figueroa/Western to Royal Palms (onshore tunnel)	4					X
JWPCP East Shaft Site	1,2					X
TraPac Shaft Site	1,2					X
LAXT Shaft Site	1,2					X
Southwest Marine Shaft Site	1,2					X
JWPCP West Shaft Site	3,4					X
Angels Gate Shaft Site	3					X
Royal Palms Shaft Site	4					X
SP Shelf Riser/Diffuser Area	1					X
PV Shelf Riser/Diffuser Area	2,3					X
Existing Ocean Outfalls Riser/Diffuser Area	1-4					X
<sup>a</sup> The onshore tunnel alignment for the Wilmington to SP Shelf is the same as the onshore tunnel alignment for the Wilmington to PV Shelf.						
Alt. = alternative						

In the alternatives analysis that follows, if a program or project element is common to more than one alternative, a detailed discussion is presented only in the first alternative in which it appears.



## 16.4.3 Alternative 1

### 16.4.3.1 Program

***Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 1 (Program) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?***

#### **San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant – Plant Expansion and Process Optimization**

##### **Construction**

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The SJCWRP plant expansion and process optimization construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. These plans include, but are not limited to, the general plan for Los Angeles County and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

Construction at the SJCWRP would not result in additional permanent employees or changes in access to the plant. Construction workers would be required for the duration of construction (approximately 2 to 3 years). All construction would be done within the existing SJCWRP site. Construction activities would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation Districts' contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction at the SJCWRP would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Tse pers. comm.). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Pomona Water Reclamation Plant – Process Optimization**

##### **Construction**

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the Pomona Police Department. The POWRP process optimization construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation systems implemented by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and Pomona Police Department. These plans include, but are not limited to, the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

Construction at the POWRP would not result in additional permanent employees or changes in access to the plant. Furthermore, all construction would be done within the existing POWRP site. Therefore, construction at the POWRP would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Wright pers. comm.). Impacts would be less than significant.

## **Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant – Process Optimization**

### **Construction**

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The LCWRP process optimization construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation systems implemented by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. These plans include, but are not limited to, the Los Angeles County General Plan, the City of Cerritos Multi-Hazard Functional Plan, and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

Construction at the LCWRP would not result in additional permanent employees or changes in access to the plant. Furthermore, all construction would be done within the existing LCWRP site. Therefore, construction at the LCWRP would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Tse pers. comm.). Impacts would be less than significant.

## **Long Beach Water Reclamation Plant – Process Optimization**

### **Construction**

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the Long Beach Fire Department, and the Long Beach Police Department. The LBWRP process optimization construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation systems implemented by the Long Beach Fire Department and the Long Beach Police Department. These plans include, but are not limited to, the Long Beach General Plan and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

Construction at the LBWRP would not result in additional permanent employees or changes in access to the plant. Furthermore, all construction would be done within the existing LBWRP site. Therefore, construction at the LBWRP would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Portolan pers. comm.; Levy pers. comm.). Impacts would be less than significant.

## **Joint Water Pollution Control Plant – Solids Processing**

### **Construction**

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The JWPCP solids processing construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. These plans include, but are not limited to, the Los Angeles County General Plan, the City of Carson Multi-Hazard Functional Plan, and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

Construction at the JWPCP would not result in additional permanent employees or changes in access to the plant. Furthermore, all construction would be done within the existing JWPCP site. Construction activities would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure

continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation Districts' contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction at the JWPCP would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Tse pers. comm.; De Cew pers. comm.). Impacts would be less than significant.

### **CEQA Impact Determination**

Construction of Alternative 1 (Program) would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Mitigation**

No mitigation is required.

#### **Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

### **16.4.3.2 Project**

***Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 1 (Project) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?***

### **Tunnel Alignment – Wilmington to San Pedro Shelf (Onshore)**

#### **Construction**

##### **CEQA Analysis**

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the EMD, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, the Los Angeles Fire Department, and the Los Angeles Port Police. The Wilmington to SP Shelf onshore tunnel construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation systems implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures; the Harbor Fire Protection Master Plan; the Los Angeles County General Plan; the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan; and the LAHD Emergency Procedures Plan.

All construction crews would be specifically trained to work within tunnels and would have standard operating procedures in case of a tunneling construction-related emergency. The Sanitation Districts' contractor would prepare and comply with the Confined Space Entry Program, as required by Title 29 of the CFR, addressing all potential physical and environmental hazards and containing procedures for safe entry into confined spaces, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Training of personnel
- Controlled access to the space

- Ventilation of the space
- Personal protective equipment
- Rescue plan provision

Contractors would also be required to operate and maintain their own safety equipment, including, but not limited to:

- Life lines
- Harnesses
- Respiratory protective equipment
- Personal protective equipment
- Shoring
- Barricades

Tunneling operations would comply with strict state and federal OSHA requirements, as discussed in Title 29 of the CFR and Title 8 of the CCR. The contractor would prepare emergency and evacuation plans that all construction workers would follow. The emergency plan would outline duties and responsibilities of all construction personnel during an emergency. The plan would include ventilation controls, firefighting equipment, rescue procedures, evacuation plans, and communications.

Tunnel construction would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation District's contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction of the onshore portion of the Wilmington to SP Shelf tunnel would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Herrera pers. comm. 2010a; Provinchain pers. comm. 2010a; Tse pers. comm.; De Cew pers. comm.). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered indirect impacts.

### **Tunnel Alignment – Wilmington to San Pedro Shelf (Offshore)**

#### **Construction**

##### CEQA Analysis

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the EMD, the Los Angeles Fire Department, the Los Angeles Port Police, and the USCG. The Wilmington to SP Shelf offshore tunnel construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation systems implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the LAHD Emergency Procedures Plan; the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures; and the Harbor Fire Protection Master Plan.

The analysis for construction of the offshore tunnel is the same as for construction of the onshore tunnel. The construction of the offshore tunnel would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation Districts' contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction of the offshore portion of the Wilmington to SP Shelf tunnel would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Provinchain pers. comm. 2010a; Herrera pers. comm. 2010a; Hennigan pers. comm. 2010b). Impacts would be less than significant.

### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered direct impacts.

## Shaft Site – JWPCP East

### Construction

#### CEQA Analysis

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The JWPCP East shaft site construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the Los Angeles County General Plan; and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

The analysis for construction of the JWPCP East shaft site is the same as for construction of the onshore portion of the Wilmington to SP Shelf tunnel. The construction of the JWPCP East shaft site would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation District's contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction at the JWPCP East shaft site would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Tse pers. comm.; De Cew pers. comm.). Impacts would be less than significant.

### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered indirect impacts.

## **Shaft Sites – TraPac, LAXT, and Southwest Marine**

### **Construction**

#### **CEQA Analysis**

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the EMD, the Los Angeles Fire Department, and the Los Angeles Port Police. The TraPac, LAXT, and Southwest Marine shaft site construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the LAHD Emergency Procedures Plan; the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures; the Harbor Fire Protection Master Plan; and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

The analysis for construction of the TraPac, LAXT, and Southwest Marine shaft sites is the same as for construction of the onshore portion of the Wilmington to SP Shelf tunnel. The construction of the shaft site would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation District's contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction at the TraPac, LAXT, and Southwest Marine shaft sites would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Herrera pers. comm. 2010a; Provinchain pers. comm. 2010a). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### **NEPA Analysis**

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered indirect impacts.

## **Riser/Diffuser Area – San Pedro Shelf**

### **Construction**

#### **CEQA Analysis**

The riser would be pre-fabricated on land prior to ocean construction. The parts and materials for the riser preassembly would be brought to the Port of Los Angeles via truck from the greater Los Angeles region. The Pasha Terminal is the assumed location for preassembly of the riser. For preassembly, approximately 10 to 15 construction workers would be on site for a 10-hour shift per day, 5 days per week, for about 8 to 10 months. The riser and diffuser construction activities and the corresponding marine vessels required for the work are summarized in Table 3-10. All of the work, including mobilization, preassembly, site preparation, construction, and demobilization, would take approximately 24 months for the riser and approximately 6 to 12 months for the diffuser.

Maritime safety, law enforcement, and emergency response are provided by the USCG. Construction on the SP Shelf would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain a safe work environment and ensure safe operating practices. Furthermore, the Sanitation District's contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction on the SP Shelf would not substantially impair implementation of or physically

interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Hennigan pers. comm. 2010b). Impacts would be less than significant. For a discussion and analysis of maritime transportation and safety, see Chapter 19.

#### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered direct impacts.

### **Riser/Diffuser Area – Existing Ocean Outfalls**

#### **Construction**

##### CEQA Analysis

Improvements to the existing ocean outfalls include joint repairs and re-ballasting. The re-ballasting work would occur on the existing 72-, 90-, and 120-inch outfalls in water depths ranging from approximately 20 to 50 feet. The marine vessels required for this work are listed in Table 3-10. The majority of the construction work would be based on one 10-hour shift per day, 5 days per week. It is estimated that approximately eight to ten construction workers would be needed for the rehabilitation work. All of the work, including mobilization, construction, and demobilization, would take approximately 9 months.

Maritime safety, law enforcement, and emergency response are provided by the USCG. Construction on the existing ocean outfalls would comply with all laws and regulations to establish a safe work environment and ensure safe operating practices. Furthermore, the Sanitation District's contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, rehabilitation of the existing ocean outfalls would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Hennigan pers. comm. 2010b). Impacts would be less than significant. For a discussion and analysis of marine transportation and safety, see Chapter 19.

##### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered direct impacts.

#### **CEQA Impact Determination**

Construction of Alternative 1 (Project) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan. Impacts under CEQA would be less than significant.

#### Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Construction of Alternative 1 (Project) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan. Impacts under NEPA would be less than significant with respect to the No-Federal-Action Alternative (see Section 3.4.1.6).

**Mitigation**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**16.4.3.3 Impact Summary – Alternative 1**

Impacts on public services analyzed in this EIR/EIS for Alternative 1 are summarized in Table 16-7 and Table 16-8. The proposed mitigation, where feasible, and the significance of the impact before and following mitigation are also listed in the tables.

**Table 16-7. Impact Summary – Alternative 1 (Program)**

<b>Program Element</b>	<b>Impact Determination Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Impact After Mitigation</b>
Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 1 (Program) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?			
SJCWRP			
Plant Expansion	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Process Optimization	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
POWRP			
Process Optimization	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
LCWRP			
Process Optimization	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
LBWRP			
Process Optimization	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
JWPCP			
Solids Processing	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction



**Table 16-8. Impact Summary – Alternative 1 (Project)**

<b>Project Element</b>	<b>Impact Determination Before Mitigation</b>	<b>NEPA Direct or Indirect</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Impact After Mitigation</b>
Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 1 (Project) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?				
Tunnel Alignment				
Wilmington to SP Shelf (Onshore)	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Wilmington to SP Shelf (Offshore)	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Shaft Site				
JWPCP East	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
TraPac	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
LAXT	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Southwest Marine	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction

**Table 16-8 (Continued)**

<b>Project Element</b>	<b>Impact Determination Before Mitigation</b>	<b>NEPA Direct or Indirect</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Impact After Mitigation</b>
<b>Riser/Diffuser Area</b>				
SP Shelf	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Existing Ocean Outfalls	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction

## 16.4.4 Alternative 2

### 16.4.4.1 Program

Alternative 2 (Program) is the same as Alternative 1 (Program).

### 16.4.4.2 Project

The impacts for the onshore tunnel; the JWPCP East, TraPac, LAXT, and Southwest Marine shaft sites; and the existing ocean outfalls for Alternative 2 (Project) would be the same as for Alternative 1 (Project).

***Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 2 (Project) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?***

### **Tunnel Alignment – Wilmington to Palos Verdes Shelf (Offshore)**

#### **Construction**

##### CEQA Analysis

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the EMD, Los Angeles Fire Department, Los Angeles Port Police, and the USCG. The Wilmington to PV Shelf offshore tunnel construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20 of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the LAHD Emergency Procedures Plan; the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures; and the Harbor Fire Protection Master Plan.

The analysis for construction of the Wilmington to PV Shelf offshore tunnel is the same as described in Section 16.4.3.2 for construction of the Wilmington to SP Shelf offshore tunnel. Therefore, construction

of the offshore portion of the Wilmington to PV Shelf tunnel would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Provinchain pers. comm. 2010a; Herrera pers. comm. 2010a; Hennigan pers. comm. 2010b). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered direct impacts.

### **Riser/Diffuser Area – Palos Verdes Shelf**

#### **Construction**

##### CEQA Analysis

The analysis for construction of the riser and diffuser on the PV Shelf is the same as for construction of the riser and diffuser on the SP Shelf described in Section 16.4.3.2 for Alternative 1.

Construction of the riser and diffuser on the PV Shelf would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Hennigan pers. comm. 2010b). Impacts would be less than significant. For a discussion and analysis of marine transportation and safety, see Chapter 19.

##### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered direct impacts.

#### **CEQA Impact Determination**

Construction of Alternative 2 (Project) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan. Impacts under CEQA would be less than significant.

##### Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

##### Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

#### **NEPA Impact Determination**

Construction of Alternative 2 (Project) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan. Impacts under NEPA would be less than significant with respect to the No-Federal-Action Alternative (see Section 3.4.1.6).

**Mitigation**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**16.4.4.3 Impact Summary – Alternative 2**

Impacts on public services for Alternative 2 (Program), which are the same as Alternative 1 (Program), are summarized in Table 16-7. Impacts analyzed in this EIR/EIS for Alternative 2 (Project) are summarized in Table 16-9. The proposed mitigation, where feasible, and the significance of the impact before and following mitigation are also listed in the tables.

**Table 16-9. Impact Summary – Alternative 2 (Project)**

<b>Project Element</b>	<b>Impact Determination Before Mitigation</b>	<b>NEPA Direct or Indirect</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Impact After Mitigation</b>
Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 2 (Project) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?				
Tunnel Alignment				
Wilmington to PV Shelf (Onshore)	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Wilmington to PV Shelf (Offshore)	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Shaft Site				
JWPCP East	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
TraPac	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction

**Table 16-9 (Continued)**

<b>Project Element</b>	<b>Impact Determination Before Mitigation</b>	<b>NEPA Direct or Indirect</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Impact After Mitigation</b>
LAXT	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Southwest Marine	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
<b>Riser/Diffuser Area</b>				
PV Shelf	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Existing Ocean Outfalls	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction

## 16.4.5 Alternative 3

### 16.4.5.1 Program

Alternative 3 (Program) is the same as Alternative 1 (Program).

### 16.4.5.2 Project

The impacts for the riser and diffuser area on the PV Shelf for Alternative 3 (Project) would be the same as for Alternative 2 (Project). The impacts for the existing ocean outfalls would be the same as for Alternative 1 (Project).

***Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 3 (Project) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?***

**Tunnel Alignment – Figueroa/Gaffey to Palos Verdes Shelf (Onshore)**

**Construction**

**CEQA Analysis**

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the EMD, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, the Los Angeles Fire Department, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, and the Los Angeles Police Department. The Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf onshore tunnel construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the Fire Protection and Prevention Plan Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan; the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures; the Los Angeles County General Plan; and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

All construction crews would be specifically trained to work within tunnels and would have standard operating procedures in case of a tunneling-construction related emergency. The Sanitation Districts' contractor would prepare and comply with the Confined Space Entry Program, as required by Title 29 of the CFR, addressing all potential physical and environmental hazards and containing procedures for safe entry into confined spaces, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Training of personnel
- Controlled access to the space
- Ventilation of the space
- Personal protective equipment
- Rescue plan provision

Contractors would also be required to operate and maintain their own safety equipment, including, but not limited to:

- Life lines
- Harnesses
- Respiratory protective equipment
- Personal protective equipment
- Shoring
- Barricades

Tunneling operations must comply with strict state and federal OSHA requirements, as discussed in Title 29 of the CFR and Title 8 of the CCR. The contractor would prepare emergency and evacuation plans that all construction workers would follow. The emergency plan would outline duties and responsibilities of all construction personnel during an emergency. The plan would include ventilation controls, firefighting equipment, rescue procedures, evacuation plans, and communications. Tunnel

construction would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation District's contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction of the onshore portion of the Wilmington to SP Shelf tunnel would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Tse pers. comm.; De Cew pers. comm.; Herrera 2010c). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered indirect impacts.

### **Tunnel Alignment – Figueroa/Gaffey to Palos Verdes Shelf (Offshore)**

#### **Construction**

#### CEQA Analysis

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the EMD, the Los Angeles Fire Department, the Los Angeles Police Department, and the USCG. The Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf offshore tunnel construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the Fire Protection and Prevention Plan Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan; the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures; and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

The analysis for construction of the offshore tunnel is the same as for construction of the onshore tunnel. The construction of the offshore tunnel would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation Districts' contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction of the offshore portion of the Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf tunnel would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Hennigan pers. comm. 2010b; Herrera pers. comm. 2010c). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered direct impacts.

## Shaft Site – JWPCP West

### Construction

#### CEQA Analysis

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the EMD, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, the Los Angeles Fire Department, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The JWPCP West shaft site construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the Los Angeles County General Plan; the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan; the Fire Protection and Prevention Plan Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan; and the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures.

The analysis for construction of the JWPCP West shaft site is the same as for construction of the onshore portion of the Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf tunnel. The construction of the shaft site would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation Districts' contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction at the JWPCP West shaft site would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Tse pers. comm.; De Cew pers. comm.; Herrera pers. comm. 2010c). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered indirect impacts.

## Shaft Site – Angels Gate

### Construction

#### CEQA Analysis

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the EMD, the Los Angeles Fire Department, and the Los Angeles Police Department. The Angels Gate shaft site construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan; the Fire Protection and Prevention Plan Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan; and the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures.

The analysis for construction of the Angels Gate shaft site is the same as for construction of the onshore portion of the Figueroa/Gaffey to PV Shelf tunnel. The construction of the shaft site would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation Districts' contractor would adhere to all



emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction at the Angels Gate shaft site would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Herrera pers. comm. 2010c). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered indirect impacts.

#### CEQA Impact Determination

Construction of Alternative 3 (Project) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan. Impacts under CEQA would be less than significant.

#### Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

#### Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Impact Determination

Construction of Alternative 3 (Project) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan. Impacts under NEPA would be less than significant with respect to the No-Federal-Action Alternative (See Section 3.4.1.6).

#### Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

#### Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

### 16.4.5.3 Impact Summary – Alternative 3

Impacts on public services for Alternative 3 (Program), which are the same as Alternative 1 (Program), are summarized in Table 16-7. Impacts analyzed in this EIR/EIS for Alternative 3 (Project) are summarized in Table 16-10. The proposed mitigation, where feasible, and the significance of the impact before and following mitigation are also listed in the tables.

**Table 16-10. Impact Summary – Alternative 3 (Project)**

<b>Project Element</b>	<b>Impact Determination Before Mitigation</b>	<b>NEPA Direct or Indirect</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Impact After Mitigation</b>
Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 3 (Project) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?				
Tunnel Alignment				
Figueroa/ Gaffey to PV Shelf (Onshore)	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Figueroa/ Gaffey to PV Shelf (Offshore)	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Shaft Site				
JWPCP West	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Angels Gate	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Riser/Diffuser Area				
PV Shelf	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Existing Ocean Outfalls	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction

## 16.4.6 Alternative 4 (Recommended Alternative)

### 16.4.6.1 Program

Alternative 4 (Program) is the same as Alternative 1 (Program).

### 16.4.6.2 Project

The impacts for the JWPCP West shaft site for Alternative 4 (Project) would be the same as for Alternative 3 (Project), except construction would occur over a period of 4 years instead of 5 years. The construction impacts for the rehabilitation of the existing ocean outfalls for Alternative 4 (Project) would be the same as for Alternative 1 (Project).

***Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 4 (Project) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?***

## Tunnel Alignment – Figueroa/Western to Royal Palms (Onshore)

### Construction

#### CEQA Analysis

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the EMD, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, the Los Angeles Fire Department, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, and the Los Angeles Police Department. The Figueroa/Western to Royal Palms onshore tunnel construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the Fire Protection and Prevention Plan Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan; the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures; the Los Angeles County General Plan; and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan.

All construction crews would be specifically trained to work within tunnels and would have standard operating procedures in case of a tunneling construction-related emergency. The Sanitation Districts' contractor would prepare and comply with a Confined Space Entry Program, as required by Title 29 of the CFR, addressing all potential physical and environmental hazards and containing procedures for safe entry into confined spaces, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Training of personnel
- Controlled access to the space
- Ventilation of the space
- Personal protective equipment
- Rescue plan provision

Contractors would also be required to operate and maintain their own safety equipment, including, but not limited to:

- Life lines
- Harnesses
- Respiratory protective equipment
- Personal protective equipment
- Shoring
- Barricades

Tunneling operations must comply with strict state and federal OSHA requirements, as discussed in Title 29 of the CFR and Title 8 of the CCR. The contractor would prepare emergency and evacuation plans that all construction workers would be trained on and comply with. The emergency plan would outline duties and responsibilities of all construction personnel during an emergency. The plan would include ventilation controls, firefighting equipment, rescue procedures, evacuation plans, and communications.

Tunnel construction would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation District's contractor would adhere to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction of the onshore portion of the Figueroa/Western to Royal Palms tunnel would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Tse pers. comm.; De Cew pers. comm.; Herrera pers. comm. 2010c). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered indirect impacts.

### **Shaft Site – Royal Palms**

#### **Construction**

#### CEQA Analysis

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the EMD, the Los Angeles Fire Department, and the Los Angeles Police Department. The Royal Palms shaft site construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by these agencies. These plans include, but are not limited to: Part 1926, Section 800, of Title 29 of the CFR; Part 1910 of Title 29 of the CFR, the Confined Space Entry Program; Title 8, Subchapter 20, of the CCR, Tunnel Safety Orders; the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan; the Fire Protection and Prevention Plan Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan; and the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures.

The analysis for construction of the Royal Palms shaft site is the same as for construction of the Figueroa/Western to Royal Palms onshore tunnel. The construction of the Royal Palms shaft site would comply with all laws and regulations to maintain emergency vehicular access and ensure continuous law enforcement access to surrounding areas. Furthermore, the Sanitation District's contractor would adhere

to all emergency response and evacuation regulations, ensuring compliance with existing emergency response plans. Therefore, construction at the Royal Palms shaft site would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Herrera pers. comm. 2010c). Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Analysis

Environmental impacts would be the same as described for the CEQA analysis, and would occur for the duration of construction. Baseline conditions would resume upon termination of construction. With respect to the Corps' NEPA scope of analysis described in Section 3.5, the environmental impacts would be considered indirect impacts.

#### CEQA Impact Determination

Construction of Alternative 4 (Project) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan. Impacts under CEQA would be less than significant.

#### Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

#### Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

#### NEPA Impact Determination

Construction of Alternative 4 (Project) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan. Impacts under NEPA would be less than significant with respect to the No-Federal-Action Alternative (see Section 3.4.1.6).

#### Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

#### Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

#### 16.4.6.3 Impact Summary – Alternative 4

Impacts on public services for Alternative 4 (Program), which are the same as Alternative 1 (Program), are summarized in Table 16-7. Impacts analyzed in this EIR/EIS for Alternative 4 (Project) are summarized in Table 16-11. The proposed mitigation, where feasible, and the significance of the impact before and following mitigation are also listed in the tables.

**Table 16-11. Impact Summary – Alternative 4 (Project)**

Project Element	Impact Determination Before Mitigation	NEPA		Residual Impact After Mitigation
		Direct or Indirect	Mitigation	
Impact PS-5. Would Alternative 4 (Project) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan?				
Tunnel Alignment				
Figueroa/ Western to Royal Palms (Onshore)	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Shaft Site				
JWPCP West	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Royal Palms	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Indirect	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
Riser/Diffuser Area				
Existing Ocean Outfalls	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	N/A	No mitigation is required.	CEQA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction
	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction	Direct	No mitigation is required.	NEPA Less Than Significant Impact During Construction

### 16.4.7 Alternative 5 (No-Project Alternative)

Pursuant to CEQA, an environmental impact report (EIR) must evaluate a no-project alternative. A no-project alternative describes the no-build scenario and what reasonably would be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved. Under the No-Project Alternative for the Clearwater Program, the Sanitation Districts would continue to expand, upgrade, and operate the JOS in accordance with the JOS 2010 Master Facilities Plan (2010 Plan) (Sanitation Districts 1994), which includes all program elements proposed under the Clearwater Program, excluding process optimization at the water reclamation plants, as described in Section 3.4.1.5. A new or modified ocean discharge system would not be constructed. As a result, there would be a greater potential for an emergency discharge into various water courses, as described in Section 3.4.1.5.

Because there would be no construction of a new or modified JWPCP ocean discharge system, the Corps would not make any significance determinations under NEPA and would not issue any permits or discretionary approvals for dredge or fill actions or for transport or ocean disposal of dredged material.

#### **16.4.7.1 Program**

Alternative 5 (Program) would consist of the implementation of the 2010 Plan. The impacts for conveyance improvements, plant expansion at the SJCWRP, WRP effluent management, JWPCP solids processing, and JWPCP biosolids management for Alternative 5 (Program) would be the same as for Alternative 1 (Program) and would be subject to mitigation in accordance with the EIR prepared for the 2010 Plan (Jones & Stokes 1994).

Emergency response and evacuation planning is the responsibility of the OEM, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. Alternative 5 construction activities would be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans implemented by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

Construction of Alternative 5 (Program) would not result in additional permanent employees or changes in access to the plants. Furthermore, all construction would be done within the footprints of the existing SJCWRP and JWPCP. Therefore, construction at the SJCWRP and the JWPCP would not substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan, or require the preparation of a new emergency response or preparedness plan (Todd pers. comm.; Tse pers. comm.; De Cew pers. comm.).

#### **16.4.7.2 Project**

Alternative 5 does not include a project; therefore, a new or modified ocean discharge system would not be constructed. As a consequence of taking no action, there would be a greater potential for emergency discharges into various water courses, as described in Section 3.4.1.5. Because construction would not take place under Alternative 5 (Project), there would be no constraints on any existing emergency response or emergency preparedness plan or emergency evacuation plan due to project elements. Police and fire services would operate and expand as needed to appropriately serve the JOS service area. Furthermore, emergency discharges could result in impacts related to flooding in public areas but would not result in significant impacts on existing emergency response, preparedness, and evacuation plans already in place that serve to evacuate people from areas experiencing flooding or other natural and human-caused disasters. Therefore, Alternative 5 (Project) would result in no impacts with regard to the implementation of existing emergency response, preparedness, and evacuation plans.

#### **16.4.7.3 Impact Summary – Alternative 5**

Impacts on public services for Alternative 5 (Program) would be the same as those summarized for Alternative 1 (Program) in Table 16-7, excluding process optimization. There would be no impacts on public services for Alternative 5 (Project).

### **16.4.8 Alternative 6 (No-Federal-Action Alternative)**

Pursuant to NEPA, an environmental impact statement (EIS) must evaluate a no-federal-action alternative. The No-Federal-Action Alternative for the Clearwater Program consists of the activities that the Sanitation Districts would perform without the issuance of the Corps' permits. The Corps' permits would be required for the construction of the offshore tunnel, construction of the riser and diffuser, the

rehabilitation of the existing ocean outfalls, and the ocean disposal of dredged material. Without a Corps permit to work on the aforementioned facilities, the Sanitation Districts would not construct the onshore tunnel and shaft sites. Therefore, none of the project elements would be constructed under the No-Federal-Action Alternative. The Sanitation Districts would continue to use the existing ocean discharge system, which could result in emergency discharges into various water courses, as described in Sections 3.4.1.6 and 16.4.7.2. The program elements for the recommended alternative would be implemented in accordance with CEQA requirements. However, based on the NEPA scope of analysis established in Sections 1.4.2 and 3.5, these elements would not be subject to NEPA because the Corps would not make any significance determinations and would not issue any permits or discretionary approvals.

#### **16.4.8.1 Program**

The program elements are beyond the NEPA scope of analysis.

#### **16.4.8.2 Project**

The impact analysis for Alternative 6 (Project) is the same as described for Alternative 5 (Project).

#### **16.4.8.3 Impact Summary – Alternative 6**

The program is not analyzed under Alternative 6. Impacts for Alternative 6 would be the same as discussed under Alternative 5 (Project); therefore, there would be no impacts on public services for Alternative 6.

### **16.4.9 Comparison of Significant Impacts and Mitigation for All Alternatives**

Impacts on public services for all alternatives would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. Therefore, a table summarizing significant impacts and mitigation is not included in this chapter.