

## 4.8 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

---

### 4.8.1 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

#### Water Service and Supply

##### *Regulatory Framework*

Over the last several years legislation has been passed into state law that is designed to improve the link between information on water supply availability and land use decisions made by local agencies. The intent is to encourage collaborate planning between local water suppliers and cities and counties by requiring the local decision-makers to consider detailed information regarding water availability prior to approval of certain development projects meeting specific criteria. This detailed information must be included in the administrative record that serves as the evidentiary basis for an approval action on such projects.

For example, Senate Bill 610 modified the California Water Code as of January 2001 to improve consideration of water supplies when making land use decisions. Pursuant to California Water Code Section 10910(a), certain projects defined in Section 10912(a) of the Water Code that are subject to CEQA must address the availability of water sources in conjunction with land planning. In addition to residential projects containing more than 500 dwelling units, this regulation applies to commercial uses employing over 1,000 people or containing 500,000 square feet of space, office uses employing 1,000 people or containing 250,000 square feet of space, or industrial uses that employ over 1,000 persons or containing 650,000 square feet of floor space.

Another water related bill passed during the 2001 state legislative session is Senate Bill 221. This law applies to residential subdivisions of more than 500 units, and hence, is not applicable to the proposed Hall of Justice project. Under SB 221, approval by a city or county of certain residential subdivisions requires an affirmative written verification of sufficient water supply. While the County Hall of Justice project is not a residential subdivision and is not subject to the requirements of SB 221, certain alternatives under consideration would exceed the threshold for commercial office space set at 250,000 square feet as described above. Consequently, Los Angeles County has requested a water supply assessment for this project consistent with Section 10910(a) of the California Water Code. The information provided in the following section is a summary of the WSA (contained in **Appendix 4.8** of this EA/EIR) and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Urban Water Management Plan (2001-2002).

### *Water Purveyor*

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) supplies water to the site. LADWP has been in existence in various forms for over 100 years with the sole purpose being to provide water and electrical services to the City of Los Angeles. The service area for the LADWP covers a 464 square mile area and delivers water and electricity to approximately 3.8 million residential and businesses accounts.

LADWP is a member agency of the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). MWD is one of 29 agencies with long-term water supply contracts with Department of Water Resources for State Water Project water. The LADWP acquires its water supply from three primary suppliers: the Los Angeles Aqueduct (LAA), the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), and local ground water.

### *Existing Water Demand*

Water demand within the service area has varied over time based on climatic and demographic trends. Current water demand within the service area of the LADWP is approximately 679,000<sup>1</sup> acre feet per year (AFY)<sup>2</sup>. While steadily increasing over time, growth in water consumption has been reduced over the past 10 years in large part due to aggressive demand reduction measures. According to the Urban Water Management Plan, the proportion of water used by various customer classes has remained relatively stable over the past 20 years. The most recent information available indicates that 35 percent of water used in the City has been consumed by single-family residential homes, 28 percent by multi-family residential uses, 17 percent by commercial use, 7 percent by governmental use, 3 percent by industrial use, and 10 percent by unbilled usage.

### *Water Supplies*

On average, the City receives about 50 percent (321,000 AFY) of its supply from the Los Angeles Aqueduct, 35 percent (232,750 AFY) from MWD, and 15 percent (92,400 AFY) from local groundwater. Each is discussed below in depth.

---

<sup>1</sup> Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Resolution 004-027, August 25, 2003.

<sup>2</sup> One acre-foot is equal to 326,000 gallons of water.

## Groundwater

LADWP maintains firm adjudication to the San Fernando, Central, Sylmar and West Coast groundwater basins with entitlement of up to 110,000 AFY. Historically, the San Fernando Water Basin has been the primary source of groundwater, providing approximately 80 percent of the groundwater extracted for use by the LADWP. The Central and Sylmar Basins provide 15 percent and 5 percent, respectively. Due to poor water quality, the LADWP does not utilize the West Coast Basin. Since 1970, local wells have produced an average of 92,400 AFY accounting for 15 percent of the City's total water supply.

### *San Fernando Basin*

The LADWP owns "pueblo rights" to the native waters of the upper Los Angeles River and to the native groundwater of the San Fernando Basin.<sup>3</sup> The King of Spain originally granted these rights in 1781 to the original settlers of Los Angeles. As a prior and paramount right, no entity other than the City has an interest in native San Fernando Valley Basin water. However, the basin also contains "import return water" which is water imported into the region that percolated into the groundwater basin as a result of subsequent use. The Los Angeles pueblo right does not extend to import water and the City must share this portion of the groundwater with the Cities of Glendale, Burbank, and San Fernando. For the City of Los Angeles, the amount of import return for a year is equal to 20.8 percent of the amount of import water delivered to lands of the San Fernando Valley Basin.

Additionally, each of the aforementioned cities has a right to store water in the San Fernando basin by either direct spreading or in-lieu practices (i.e., city receives credit for withdrawing less groundwater than entitlement allows). The most recent data available indicates the LADWP has a water storage credit of 255,000 AFY in the basin that is allocated for uses during periods of prolong shortage. The Upper Los Angeles River Area Watermaster manages groundwater withdrawal in the San Fernando Basin.

### *Sylmar Basin*

Both the City of Los Angeles and the City of San Fernando possess appropriative rights, of equal priority, to the native waters of the Sylmar Basin not used for the reasonable beneficial needs of the overlying users.<sup>4</sup> The City also maintains import return water rights in the Sylmar Basin equal to 35.7 percent of water imported into the Sylmar Basin annually. In total, the City is entitled to extract 3,100 AFY from this

---

<sup>3</sup> *City of Los Angeles vs. City of San Fernando et al.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

basin. The Upper Los Angeles River Area Watermaster manages groundwater withdrawal in the Sylmar Basin.

#### *Central Basin*

The City is allowed to pump up to 15,000-acre feet of water annually under a judgment that established the California Department of Water Resources as the Watermaster for this basin. The judgment allows for a one-year carryover of groundwater allotment that is not used in the previous year. This carryover cannot exceed 3,000-acre feet per year. If a water emergency is declared by the Watermaster, additional amounts of water may be carried over above that allowed by the one-year carry over provision. Thus, in times of a water emergency the City may pump up to 23,250 AFY the following year.

#### **Imported Surface Waters**

The LADWP maintains a diverse mix of imported water supplied by the Los Angeles and Colorado River Aqueduct systems. Each is discussed in depth below.

#### *Los Angeles Aqueduct*

The Los Angeles Aqueducts delivers snowmelt runoff from the Eastern Sierra Nevada extending from the Mono Basin to Los Angeles where it is stored in several reservoirs. Since 1989, when City water exports were curtailed to restore the Mono Basin's ecosystem, water deliveries from the Los Angeles Aqueduct have ranged from a low of 106,700 acre feet in 1990 to a high of 466,800 acre feet in 1998. Average water deliveries since that time period have been 295,500 acre feet.

Computer modeling conducted by the LADWP to determine the probability of future supplies during periods of normal and dry rainfall predict that the median annual delivery from the aqueduct over the next 20 years is expected to be approximately 321,000 AFY. Dry year deliveries are predicted to be approximately 160,000 AFY, with a single year delivery minimum of about 113,000 AFY.

#### *Metropolitan Water District of Southern California*

LADWP is a member agency of the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), which acts as a wholesale water agency for the purpose of contracting with the State Department of Water Resources ("DWR") for a supplemental supply of imported water from the State Water Project ("SWP"). LADWP has historically purchased MWD water to make up the deficit between demand and other City supplies.

At the inception of the SWP, DWR entered into individual water supply contracts with agricultural and urban water suppliers (SWP contractors) throughout California. The contracts were the method used to fund construction and operation of the SWP facilities for the delivery of water to the SWP contractors. Each such contract sets forth a maximum annual entitlement of SWP water, which is stated in Table A to the contract ("Table A entitlement").

The demands of SWP contractors vary from year-to-year depending on many factors, including the amount of winter rains, agricultural markets, the availability (and cost) of other water resources, municipal and industrial demands and environmental requirements associated with the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta ("Delta"), through which the water supplied by the SWP must pass. Historically, the SWP has delivered water in excess of SWP contractors' requests. From 1962 to 1999, the SWP delivered water in excess of the SWP contractors' requests in all but four years. Over the next 20 years, the MWD expects to receive a minimum of 650,000-acre feet of water during dry years from the SWP, which represents 31 percent of the district's entitlement.

The MWD also maintains entitlement to 1.25 million-acre feet of water from the Colorado River. In order to ensure the future stable supply of this resource, MWD is working with the Secretary of the Interior and other stakeholders to implement the California Colorado River Water Use Plan. The plan represents a strategy that allows California to meet demand within the 4.4 million-acre feet of entitlement allotted to the state. The plan envisions various water transfer, storage, and exchange agreements with private companies and agencies with Colorado River water rights, such as the Imperial Irrigation District and the Coachella Valley Water District. An agreement between MWD, the San Diego Water Authority, and the Imperial Irrigation District to exchange up to 200,000-acre feet of water has already been reached.

MWD also provides incentives to the member agencies that promote conservation, water recycling, groundwater storage and replenishment, or conjunctive reuse operations. MWD has committed funds to over 70 projects expected to produce 270,000 AFY of water by the year 2020. Based on the above, total water supplies available to the MWD are outlined below in Table 4.8-1.

**Table 4.8-1**  
**MWD Firm (Dry Year) Water Supplies**

Source	Quantity (AFY)
Colorado River Supply	1,050,000 AFY
State Water Project Supply	650,000 AFY
Storage/Exchange Programs	400,000 AFY
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,100,000 AFY</b>

Source: *Urban Water Management Plan (2001-2002)*, LADWP

### *Water Recycling*

On-going and future conservation programs are an integral component of the water supply plan. LADWP predicts that conservation and recycling programs would be developed to save 74,000 AFY of water that would otherwise have been used for potable purposes. It is estimated that 42,000 AFY would be used to enhance City groundwater supply reliability while almost 30,000 AFY would be used for irrigation and industrial purposes. Another 2,500 AFY is to be used as a barrier against seawater intrusion.

### *Water Distribution Infrastructure*

An existing water distribution system provides water for potable use and fire suppression in the existing Hall of Justice building and surrounding area. The existing water line serving the site is a 6-inch line located within the Temple Street right of way.

### **Sewer Service**

#### *Wastewater Collection*

Wastewater in the area is collected and transported through a network of local, trunk, and mainline sewers to the Hyperion Treatment Plant in Playa del Rey. The existing Hall of Justice building is connected to several sewer laterals including two 10-inch lines, two 6-inch lines, and one 8-inch line. A review of the physical condition and capacity of this sewer network was conducted as part of the environmental review of the Amended Little Tokyo Redevelopment Plan (June 2002). That study indicated adequate capacity is available in the overall sewer system of the area, with existing sewage flows in the lines measured at lows of 33 percent of design capacity to a maximum of 58 percent of design capacity, dependent upon the specific line under consideration.<sup>5</sup>

#### *Wastewater Treatment*

The HTP currently provides wastewater treatment for nearly all of the City of Los Angeles as well as several contract cities and portions of Los Angeles County. The drainage area served by the HTP is approximately 328,000 acres of developed land. Completed in 1950, the HTP was originally designed with a treatment capacity of 320 million gallons per day (MGD). Since that time, the plant's capacity has

---

<sup>5</sup> City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency, Amended Little Tokyo Redevelopment Plan FEIR, June 2002 (SCH# 1990010107).

increased to 450 MGD with full secondary treatment. The HTP treated approximately 358 MGD of solid waste in the year 2000<sup>6</sup>, which equates to an excess dry weather capacity of approximately 92 MGD.

## Energy

### *Service Providers*

The local electric service provider is the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. The existing Hall of Justice power service feeds from a 5-inch conduit routed through the underground utility tunnel below Temple Street. This line connects to a breaker section installed in the switchboard unit located in the Criminal Courts building. A second, "spare" 5-inch conduit runs parallel to the live one connecting to a second breaker section at the switchboard located below the court building. LADWP indicates that utilization is well within the switchboard capacity.

The local provider of natural gas is the Southern California Gas Company (SCG). The existing source of natural gas for the Hall of Justice building is via a 1-inch line that enters the building off of Broadway. The new development plan does not require natural gas service, so this line would be capped and no further discussion of natural gas is provided in this analysis.

### *Power Generation and Demand*

Table 4.8-2, provides a breakdown of in-state electrical energy generation by type, for the 10-year period from 1989 to 1999. As shown, electricity is generated by a variety of sources with the top five including hydroelectric, nuclear, coal, natural gas, and geothermal. These sources have remained stable producers over the 10-year period representing roughly 70 percent of the power generated in the state over this time.

These are not the only sources of power available to residents of the state since power generation and distribution systems located throughout the western United States are linked together by a network of transmission lines and relay substations. Under normal circumstances, California exports electricity in the winter months when demand is lower and imports electricity during the summer when peak loads are high. This is evident on Table 4.8-2, which also identifies the energy imported into the state during this same 10-year period.

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

**Table 4.8-2**  
**California Electrical Energy Generation, 1983 to 1999**  
**Total Production by Resource Type**  
**(millions of kilowatt hours)**

	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
<b>Total Generation:</b>	238,567	252,355	242,343	245,535	242,026	256,719	256,367	253,621	255,080	276,412	275,792
Hydroelectric	32,742	26,092	23,244	22,373	41,595	25,626	51,665	47,883	41,400	48,757	41,617
Nuclear	33,803	36,586	37,167	38,622	36,579	38,828	36,186	39,753	37,267	41,715	40,419
Coal	19,702	21,402	23,442	32,435	22,907	25,095	17,925	25,460	27,114	34,537	36,327
Oil	9,275	4,449	523	107	2,085	1,954	489	693	143	123	55
Gas	78,916	76,082	75,828	87,032	70,715	95,025	78,378	66,711	74,341	82,052	84,703
Geothermal	15,247	16,038	15,566	16,491	15,770	15,573	14,267	13,539	11,950	12,554	13,251
Organic Waste	5,204	6,644	7,312	7,362	5,760	7,173	5,969	5,557	5,701	5,266	5,663
Wind	2,139	2,418	2,669	2,707	2,867	3,293	3,182	3,154	2,739	2,776	3,433
Solar	471	681	719	700	857	798	793	832	810	839	838
Other	4	4	0	2	0	0	0	343	896	230	0
Energy Imports	41,064	61,959	55,873	37,704	42,892	43,354	47,514	49,696	52,720	47,563	49,487

*Source: California Energy Commission.  
Electricity Analysis Office, 2000.*

For purposes of comparison, Table 4.8-3 provides a breakdown of electrical demand for the State of California from 1980 through the year 2010. This represents a measurement of the amount of electricity used at homes and business within California and does not include the actual amount of energy provided by generators and supplied over the grid to account for losses during distribution. As shown, the state has experienced an annual average growth rate of 3.2 percent for the 10-year period from 1980 to 1990. Due to the recession of the early 1990s, the demand slowed during the period from 1990 to 1998 with an annual average rate of growth calculated at 0.9 percent. Total electrical consumption in the state was 244,409 gigawatt hours for the year 1998. Future demand is projected to increase at a 2 percent annual average rate for the period 1998 to 2010.



**Table 4.8-3**  
**Electricity Consumption Year 1980 to 2010**  
**(GWH)**

Year	PG&E	SMUD	SCE	LADWP	SDG&E	Other	State
1980	66,197	5,352	59,624	17,669	9,730	8,406	166,979
1990	86,806	8,358	81,673	21,971	14,798	14,432	228,038
1998	95,601	9,123	88,434	23,004	17,630	10,617	244,409
2004	109,219	10,460	100,822	24,985	20,539	13,541	279,565
2010	121,041	11,692	113,137	26,684	23,022	14,293	309,868

*Source: California Energy Commission  
 Technical Report to California Energy Outlook, June 2000*

## Energy Conservation

The California Energy Commission passed AB 970 in the summer of 2000 and it was signed into law on September 6, 2000. This legislation modified Title 24 of the California Government Code in order to promote energy efficiency in new construction. The new standards go into effect for building permits issued on or after June 1, 2001. The standards are intended to reduce peak demand and so are more stringent in areas with high cooling loads such as Sacramento, the Central Valley, and all of inland Southern California. All new development projects are required to comply with the Title 24 requirements for the climate zone in which the project is proposed.

The primary changes involve tighter air duct systems to reduce energy loss and high efficiency window glass. The new duct provisions would require leakage to be less than 6 percent of nominal airflow and that installers certify all installations. The improved windows have spectrally selective glass that reduces heat radiation. These standards are estimated to improve energy efficiency up to 23 percent for residential uses in climate zone 15 (High Desert). Certain features in the new standards require third-party field verification.

## Solid Waste

### *Collection and Disposal*

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) has the responsibility to develop plans and strategies to manage and coordinate the solid waste generated (including hazardous waste) in the County unincorporated areas and address the disposal needs of Los Angeles County as a whole. Private

waste haulers collect waste generated from commercial and industrial uses and large, multi-family residential buildings (over four units in size) in the unincorporated area. When collected, the waste may be taken to any landfill that is willing to accept it and which provides the greatest economic advantages to the hauler, based on location and disposal fees.

There are currently about 14 permitted Class III landfills operating in Los Angeles County and two waste-to-energy facilities (also referred to as transformation facilities). Combined, these landfills have a throughput rate of 87,890 tons per day. A total of 1.1 million tons of solid waste was collected within unincorporated Los Angeles County for the year 2000 (latest data available). Of this total, approximately 9,447 tons was burned to create energy in the transformation facilities while approximately 1 million tons of waste required disposal in a sanitary landfill.<sup>7</sup>

According to the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Plan 2000 Annual Report (prepared by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, September 2001), the remaining permitted Class III landfill capacity in Los Angeles County as of December 31, 2000 was approximately 96.5 million tons. The 2000 Annual Report estimates that Class III landfill capacity needs may exceed the remaining capacity within Los Angeles County by around the year 2009. The actual date at which capacity is exhausted would depend on variables such as the amount of waste import and export, the time necessary to develop additional capacity, and future permitted landfill capacity. The capacity for unclassified landfills (those that accept inert waste only) is expected to last for about 44 years.

It should be reiterated that a number of disposal sites outside of Los Angeles County accepts wastes generated in the County. Private haulers have and will continue to transport waste to landfills located outside of Los Angeles County as limited capacity of in-County facilities creates economic incentive for private haulers to look elsewhere for disposal. For the year 2000, landfills accepting waste generated in Los Angeles County include the Bena & Arvin Sanitary Landfills in Kern County, the B-J Dropbox Refuse Disposal Site in Solano County, Colton, Fontana & Victorville Refuse Disposal Sites in San Bernardino County, Frank R. Bowerman & Olinda Alpha Sanitary Landfills located in Orange County, the El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill in Riverside County, and the Simi Valley Landfill in Ventura County.<sup>8</sup>

Certain uses and activities generate hazardous waste that must be disposed at locations other than Class III or unclassified landfills. A generator is a person or business whose acts or processes produce

---

<sup>7</sup> California Integrated Waste Management Board, Jurisdiction Diversion and Disposal Profile: Los Angeles County at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles>.

<sup>8</sup> California Integrated Waste Management Board, Jurisdiction Diversion and Disposal Profile: Los Angeles County at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles>.

hazardous waste or who in some other manner causes a hazardous substance or waste to become subject to the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (HWCL, Health and Safety Code Sections 25100 through 25249). These hazardous materials then need to be disposed of or transported to a licensed disposal or treatment facility. However, the disposal and transport of hazardous materials is a little more complicated than that of the typical Class III solid waste because there are many forms of hazardous materials. Generators that use hazardous materials and or generate hazardous waste are responsible for the disposal of the waste. There are many licensed private contractors that transport and dispose hazardous waste.

In their response to the Notice of Preparation, the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works indicates that existing hazardous waste management facilities within the County are inadequate to meet the waste currently generated within Los Angeles. However, there are several Class I and II landfills that exist in Southern California that can accept hazardous waste generated within the County. Each is identified briefly below:

- **Laidlaw Landfill, Buttonwillow, California:** This facility accepts hazardous and non-hazardous waste and is permitted as a Class I landfill. The facility has no restrictions for the amount of waste that can be accepted on a daily basis.
- **Kettleman Hills Landfill, Kettleman City, California:** This is a Class I permitted landfill that accepts hazardous and non-hazardous waste with no capacity restrictions.
- **McKittrick Waste Treatment Site, McKittrick, California:** This facility is a Class II permitted landfill that accepts hazardous and non-hazardous waste. The facility has a capacity restriction of 412 cubic meters daily.

### ***Solid Waste Reduction and Reuse Plans***

The California Integrated Waste Management<sup>9</sup> Act of 1989 (AB 939) requires every city and county in the state to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) that identifies how each jurisdiction will meet the mandatory state waste diversion goal of 50 percent by the year 2000. The purpose of AB 939 is to "reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste generated in the state to the maximum extent feasible." Noncompliance with this goal can be severe with fines up to \$10,000 per day on jurisdictions (city and counties) not diverting 50 percent or more of its wastes from landfill disposal.

---

<sup>9</sup> The expression "integrated waste management" refers to the use of a variety of waste management practices to safely and effectively handle the municipal solid waste stream with the least adverse impact on human health and the environment. The Act has established waste prioritization as follows: source reduction, recycling, composting, energy recovery, landfilling, and household hazardous waste management.

Subsequent to the Integrated Waste Management Act, additional legislation was passed to assist local jurisdictions in accomplishing the goals of AB 939. The California Solid Waste Re-use and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (Section 42900–42911 of the Public Resources Code) directs the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) to draft a “model ordinance” relating to adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials in development projects. If by September 1, 1994, a local agency did not adopt its own ordinance based on the CIWMB model, the CIWMB model took effect for that local agency. The County of Los Angeles chose to use the CIWMB model ordinance.

All development projects in Los Angeles County are required to participate in the waste management and recycling programs currently in operation in the County as defined by its adopted SRRE. The County has a diversion rate of 40 percent for the year 1999, which is the latest Board of Supervisor’s reviewed diversion rate for unincorporated Los Angeles County.<sup>10</sup> This diversion will increase the life expectancy of landfills, but not eliminate the need for new landfill space. As growth occurs throughout Southern California, new landfill space would need to be developed and maximized and/or other waste disposal alternatives would need to be implemented.

#### 4.8.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County of Los Angeles Initial Study (Appendix 1.0) suggests that a project would result in a significant impact to utilities and other services if:

- (a) The project site is located in an area known to have inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs;
- (b) The project site is located in an area known to have inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire-fighting needs;
- (c) The project site is in an area known to have inadequate groundwater supply and proposes new water wells.
- (d) The project would create problems providing electricity or natural gas to meet consumer demand.
- (e) The project site is located in an area with known service problems (solid waste).

---

<sup>10</sup> California Integrated Waste Management Board, Jurisdiction Diversion and Disposal Profile: Los Angeles County at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles>.

### 4.8.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

#### **Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative**

Under Alternative 1, the Hall of Justice would remain vacant and unsafe for occupancy and would continue to deteriorate physically. No demand for potable water, energy or landfill capacity would be associated with this alternative.

#### **Alternative 2 – Repair and Reuse Alternative (Proposed Alternative)**

##### *Water Service and Supply*

The Repair and Reuse Alternative would result in the reconstruction and subsequent occupation of the existing Hall of Justice building. A total of 325,000 square feet of useable square feet of space would be developed and occupied at buildout of this alternative. This analysis identifies the potable water demand associated with occupation of this alternative and the water supplies available to the DWP to meet projected water demands within their service during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

##### **Supply and Demand Analysis**

Estimated water demand at full occupancy under this alternative would be approximately 123,149 gallons per day or 138 acre feet per year. This is a decrease in daily water demand by 126,485 gallons per day or 142 acre feet from baseline conditions in 1994. Water conservation measures, as required by the State of California, would be incorporated into the renovated structure. Specific measures would include the use of low-flush toilets and urinals consistent with Health and Safety Code Section 17921.3, use of self-closing faucets in public lavatories consistent with Government Code Section 7800, and use of insulation and water-heating systems to reduce water used before hot water reaches equipment or fixtures.

Renovation and reuse of the property as office space is consistent with existing zoning and General Plan designations for the site. As such, the project is within the growth projections contained in the Los Angeles General Plan Framework, so this water demand was taken into account in the projections contained in the 2000 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) prepared by LADWP. Consequently, data from the UWMP demonstrates the sufficiency of future water supplies to meet project demands as detailed below.

**Table 4.8-4** outlines the water supply available to the DWP to meet demand during normal years of rainfall. As shown, the UWMP indicates that sufficient water supplies are available to service all projected growth through the year 2020, inclusive of the proposed project, during normal years.

**Table 4.8-4**  
**UWMP Projected Supply vs. Demand (acre feet/year)**  
**Normal Year**

Supply Source	Year			
	2005	2010	2015	2020
Los Angeles Aqueduct	296,000	296,000	296,000	296,000
Local Wells	108,000	108,000	108,000	108,000
Metropolitan Water District	267,350	284,400	318,150	354,450
Recycled Water	7,650	18,400	23,650	29,350
Seawater Desalination	---	11,200	11,200	11,200
<b>Total Supply</b>	<b>679,000</b>	<b>718,000</b>	<b>757,000</b>	<b>799,000</b>
<b>Total Demand</b>	<b>679,000</b>	<b>718,000</b>	<b>756,000</b>	<b>800,000</b>
<b>Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>

*Source: Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, August 25, 2003*

Dry year supply and demand calculations are provided below in **Table 4.8-5**. LADWP projected dry year demands by assuming that water needs would increase by 6 percent over normal year demands. This assumption was supported by historical data for usage under varying weather patterns, where water usage fluctuated by plus or minus 6 percent.

The water supply assigned to the groundwater wells in the normal year analysis represent the maximum yield that may be obtained annually under current rights (exclusive of the right to DWP San Fernando Basin storage credits), plus 100 percent of the amount of water recharged into the San Fernando Basin. In addition, the Annual Total Groundwater Allotment for LADWP represents a level of extraction that will preserve the integrity of these basins as determined by the Water Management Plan. Consequently, the levels of groundwater production proposed in the UWMP are self-sustaining and would be sufficient to meet the demands through the year 2020.

As shown, the LADWP maintains sufficient supplies to meet increased demand experienced during periods of low rainfall. On the whole, water supplies of the City of Los Angeles would be sufficient to meet projected water demands over the next twenty years. This would include the projected water demand for Alternative 2. Given the above, rehabilitation and reuse as considered under Alternative 2 would not cause a significant impact on water supplies within the LADWP service area.

**Table 4.8-5  
UWMP Projected Supply vs. Demand (acre feet/year)  
Dry Year**

Supply Source	Year			
	2005	2010	2015	2020
Los Angeles Aqueduct	135,000	135,000	135,000	135,000
Local Wells <sup>1</sup>	135,000	135,000	135,000	135,000
Metropolitan Water District <sup>2</sup>	442,350	461,400	497,150	536,450
Recycled Water	7,650	18,400	23,650	29,350
Seawater Desalination	—	11,200	11,200	11,200
<b>Total Supply</b>	<b>720,000</b>	<b>761,000</b>	<b>802,000</b>	<b>847,000</b>
<b>Total Demand</b>	<b>720,000</b>	<b>761,000</b>	<b>802,000</b>	<b>847,000</b>
<b>Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

*Source: Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, August 25, 2003.*

### Fire flows

Fire flow rates for commercial office uses vary depending upon lot and building size. Sufficient capacity is available in the existing system to accommodate the needs under Alternative 2. Fire flow requirements for the project would be set by the Fire Department prior to final site plan approval. Given the above, no significant impacts are anticipated.

### Sewer Service

#### Wastewater Collection

Estimated wastewater generation upon full occupancy under this alternative would be approximately 36,565 gallons per day. The repaired Hall of Justice structure requires only a single 8-inch line for service, but preliminary plans propose to split the service to two of the existing facilities, which allows greater flexibility in system design. The project would connect to the existing system, which involves coordination with the City Department of Public Works regarding design, operation, and maintenance. The project applicant would also pay sewage connection fees based on the number of plumbing fixtures associated with the project. These funds are used to provide relief for existing lines nearing capacity in the downtown area. Based on the above, and that adequate capacity exists within the receiving trunk sewer, no significant impact to wastewater collection and distribution facilities would occur as a result of project development.

## Wastewater Treatment

Effluent generated under Alternative 2 represents less than 1 percent of the treatment plant's remaining capacity of 92 MGD. Since effluent generated under this alternative would be within the existing remaining capacity of the plant, no significant impact to treatment facilities would occur.

## Energy

During construction and renovation activities, the proposed Hall of Justice building would require the expenditure of electrical energy to operate power equipment, provide light and cooling. At buildout, electricity would be required to operate cooling equipment, provide lighting and power appliances and equipment. Table 4.8-6 summarizes the use rates for electricity provided by the South Coast Air Quality Management District's *Air Quality Handbook*.

**Table 4.8-6  
Electricity Consumption Rates By Land Use Type**

Land Use	Electricity (kWh/yr.)*
Single Family Residential	6,081/unit
Multi-Family Residential	6,081/unit
Office	8.8/sf
Restaurant	47.3/sf
Retail	11.8/sf
Food Store	51.4/sf
Warehouse	3.4/sf
Elementary School	6.3/sf
College/University	11.6/sf
Hospital	17.9/sf
Hotel/Motel	6.8/sf
Miscellaneous (all other uses)	8.8/sf

Source: SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook.

\* Numbers are for SCE service area.

Based on these rates, the demand for energy at buildout of Alternative 2 is approximately 2.8 million kilowatts of electricity annually.<sup>11</sup> These energy resources are available commercially and would likely be utilized at other sites if not used for this project. Given that supplies of these materials are adequate,

<sup>11</sup> Alternative 2 contains 325,000 useable sf, which would consume an estimated 8.8 kWh per square foot (325,000 x 8.8 kWh/sf = 2,860,000 kWh).



and that the project is subject to energy conservation measures outlined in Title 24, no significant impacts are anticipated with selection of Alternative 2.

### ***Solid Waste***

Future development under this alternative would generate solid waste during construction and operational phases. Construction debris would be generated as a result of demolition and building renovations. Materials removed could be used as fill for other projects in the area, or disposed of at a landfill. A licensed hazardous waste disposal expert would be required to dispose of all hazardous materials (e.g., asbestos and lead-based paint, hazardous materials storage tanks, or contaminated soils, if any, in accordance with applicable regulations (i.e., SCAQMD Rules and Regulations for asbestos, see also Section 4.3 regarding Hazardous Materials).

Because of the many laws and regulations associated with the disposal of hazardous waste, it would have to be determined at the time of disposal where any certain hazardous waste would be taken. However, hazardous debris generated during renovation of the proposed structure can be accommodated by the permitted Class I and II landfills currently in operation within Southern California, and no significant impact to hazardous waste disposal facilities are expected as a result of this alternative.

Similarly, the impact of general demolition debris on area landfills would be temporary and would cease upon completion of construction activities. Based on the short-term nature of construction activity and the remaining permitted capacity of landfills accepting waste in the County, no significant construction impacts on solid waste disposal facilities are anticipated.

Operation of office uses associated with Alternative 2 are anticipated to generate a variety of waste types including food (17%), paper (32.5%), plastic (10.5%) and corrugated cardboard (7%) based on data provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board. Using solid waste generation rates provided by the Board, full occupancy under Alternative 2 is anticipated to generate approximately 593 tpy of waste assuming no recycling as outlined in Table 4.8-7.

**Table 4.8-7**  
**Estimated Annual Solid Waste Generation – Assuming No Recycling**  
**Alternative 2**

Land Use	Space	Generation Rate (lbs/day)	Total Generation (tpy)
Office	325,000 sq. ft.	0.01	593
<b>Total</b>			<b>593</b>

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board, [www.ciwmb.ca.gov/wastechar/WasteGenRates.htm](http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/wastechar/WasteGenRates.htm).

It is not possible to determine a specific landfill that would receive solid waste generated by users of the renovated structure. This is because private carriers have the option of disposing solid waste at any number of available landfills in-County and out-of-County (e.g., Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Ventura) dependent upon tipping fees, transportation costs, and other economic considerations. Consequently, no single landfill would accept all the solid waste generated over the lifespan of this project.

Moreover, all development projects in unincorporated areas are required to cooperate with Countywide programs and to implement site-specific source reduction, recycling and reuse programs. The renovated Hall of Justice property would cooperate with these existing programs through actions such as use of designated recycling separation areas that are conveniently located and prominently marked. With participation in these programs, the estimated 539 tpy of increased solid waste generated by the proposed project would be reduced by up to 50 percent. Further, the County is obligated to meet the recycling and source reduction requirements of AB 939 and, therefore, must continue the recycling programs in place and expand these programs as needed. Compliance with these requirements would reduce the volume of waste entering landfills. Based on the incorporation of source reduction and recycling into the project design, and the disposal options available throughout the Southern California region, solid waste generation and disposal associated with this alternative would not be considered a significant impact.

### **Alternative 3 – Adaptive Reuse of the Existing Building to Secretary of Interior Standards**

#### *Water Service and Supply*

Estimated wastewater generation upon full occupancy under this alternative would be approximately 30,000 gallons per day. As described under Alternative 2, this alternative would also incorporate water

conservation features consistent with state law and renovation and reuse of the property as proposed would be consistent with existing zoning and General Plan designations for the site. As such, the project is within the growth projections contained in the Los Angeles General Plan Framework, so this water demand was taken into account in the projections contained in the 2000 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) prepared by LADWP. Consequently, data from the UWMP demonstrates the sufficiency of future water supplies to meet project demands as detailed above under Alternative 2 and no significant impacts are anticipated.

### *Sewer Service*

#### **Wastewater Collection**

Estimated wastewater generation upon full occupancy under this alternative would be approximately 22,500 gallons per day. The repaired Hall of Justice structure requires only a single 8-inch line for service, but preliminary plans propose to split the service to two of the existing facilities, which allows greater flexibility in system design. The project would connect to the existing system, which involves coordination with the City Department of Public Works regarding design, operation, and maintenance. The project applicant would also pay sewage connection fees based on the number of plumbing fixtures associated with the project. These funds are used to provide relief for existing lines nearing capacity in the downtown area. Based on the above, and that adequate capacity exists within the receiving trunk sewer, no significant impact to wastewater collection and distribution facilities would occur as a result of project development.

#### **Wastewater Treatment**

Effluent generated under Alternative 3 represents less than 1 percent of the treatment plant's remaining capacity of 92 MGD. Since effluent generated under this alternative would be within the existing remaining capacity of the plant, no significant impact to treatment facilities would occur.

### *Energy*

During construction and renovation activities, the proposed Hall of Justice building would require the expenditure of electrical energy to operate power equipment, provide light and cooling. At buildout, electricity would be required to operate cooling equipment, provide lighting and power appliances and equipment. Based on consumption rates described above in Table 4.8-6, the demand for energy at

buildout of Alternative 3 is approximately 1.75 million kilowatts of electricity annually.<sup>12</sup> These energy resources are available commercially and would likely be utilized at other sites if not used for this project. Given that supplies of these materials are adequate, and that the project is subject to energy conservation measures outlined in Title 24, no significant impacts are anticipated with selection of Alternative 3.

### *Solid Waste*

Future development under Alternative 3 would generate construction debris and possibly hazardous materials associated with renovation of the existing structure. A licensed hazardous waste disposal expert would be required to dispose of all hazardous materials (e.g., asbestos and lead-based paint, hazardous materials storage tanks, or contaminated soils, if any) in accordance with applicable regulations as outlined above under Alternative 2. Given the remaining capacity of Class I and II landfills capable of accepting such waste and the short-term nature of the renovation activity, no significant impact to hazardous waste disposal facilities are anticipated under Alternative 3.

Construction debris and waste generated during occupancy of the renovated facility would be separated and recycled to the extent feasible consistent with current County plans and policies outlined above. Construction debris would only be generated during renovation activity and would cease upon completion of redevelopment activity. Based on the short-term nature of renovation activity and the remaining availability of landfill space throughout Southern California, no significant impact to landfill disposal facilities would take place during renovation and construction of the project.

Similar to Alternative 2, operation of office uses associated would generate a variety of waste types including food, paper, plastic and corrugated cardboard. Using solid waste generation rates provided by the Board, full occupancy under Alternative 3 is anticipated to generate approximately 363 tpy of waste assuming no recycling (Table 4.8-8). Future occupants of the building would be required to participate in the County's source reduction and recycling programs. With participation in these programs, the estimated 363 tpy of increased solid waste generated by the proposed project would be reduced by up to 50 percent. Further, the County is obligated to meet the recycling and source reduction requirements of AB 939 and, therefore, must continue the recycling programs in place and expand these programs as needed. Compliance with these requirements would reduce the volume of waste entering landfills. Based on the incorporation of source reduction and recycling into the project design and the disposal

---

<sup>12</sup> Alternative 3 contains 199,132 useable sf, which would consume an estimated 8.8 kWh per square foot (199,132 x 8.8 kWh/sf = 1,752,361 kWh).

options available throughout the Southern California region, solid waste generation and disposal associated with this alternative would not be considered a significant impact.

**Table 4.8-8**  
**Estimated Annual Solid Waste Generation – Assuming No Recycling**  
**Alternative 3**

Land Use	Space	Generation Rate (lbs/day)	Total Generation (tpy)
Office	199,132 sq. ft.	0.01	363
Total			363

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board, [www.ciwmb.ca.gov/wastechar/WasteGenRates.htm](http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/wastechar/WasteGenRates.htm).

#### 4.8.4 MITIGATION MEASURES (ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 3)

No mitigation measures are required for either Alternative 2 or 3.

#### 4.8.5 ADVERSE IMPACTS AFTER MITIGATION (ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 3)

Impacts under Alternative 2 or 3 would be less than significant.

