

An irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable resources would occur as a result of the approval of the expansion of the Tehachapi SLF. Nonrenewable energy resources would be committed primarily in the form of fossil fuels, including fuel, oil, and gasoline used by equipment associated with the construction of the drainage improvements and operations over the extended lifespan (See Section 5.5 for a greater discussion of energy impacts). If the Tehachapi SLF is not expanded, the facility would close in the near future and a transfer station would be constructed to transport waste to another permitted facility. This would cause waste currently coming to the Tehachapi SLF to be collected and then hauled greater distances to either the Bena SLF or Mojave-Rosamond Recycling and Sanitary Landfill as the nearest alternative sites, or another permitted disposal facility.

Without implementation of the 2014 Project, a majority of these resources would still be expended to handle the waste disposal, whether at this site or another permitted facility. However, provided that these commitments occur in accordance with the adopted goals, policies, and implementation measures of the Kern County General Plan, as a matter of public policy, those commitments have been determined to be acceptable.

Energy Resources Impacts

To ensure that energy implications are considered in public agency decisions, CEQA requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy (Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3)). The primary energy implication associated with landfill disposal activities at the Tehachapi SLF is the fossil fuel energy expended for the landfill operations equipment and waste transport vehicles. A relatively small amount of electricity is currently utilized for landfill operations in the form of power supplied to the gatehouse. Electricity is provided to the project site by the Southern California Edison Company. Electrical utilities to the landfill are served by power poles along Tehachapi Boulevard and a power pole line extending along the east side of the Tehachapi SLF entrance road.

A substantial increase in the use of electricity is not expected as a result of the landfill expansion. The existing daily operations, in terms of size of the gatehouse and number staff, would not increase due to the 2014 Project. The 2014 Project would increase the lifespan of the facility, and therefore electrical use at the gatehouse for another 6 years. However, even if the 2014 Project does not occur, electricity at the facility would still be used to operate the transfer station after the landfill has reached its final permitted capacity. Approval of the 2014 Project would only delay the construction of the transfer station and would not result in an increase in electricity at the site. Therefore, the 2014 Project would not substantially increase the use of electricity over the existing condition, and would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy in the form of electricity.

With respect to the use of fossil fuels, the continued operation of the Tehachapi SLF would involve the consumption of gasoline and diesel fuel associated with employee trips, waste truck trips, and operations equipment. In addition, the construction of the drainage improvements would consume a very small amount of fossil fuels associated with construction equipment. However, the expansion of the landfill in and of itself,

Table 4.7-2
Tehachapi Sanitary Landfill
Contribution to Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MTCO₂E)
2013 & 2020

Year	Methane Emissions	Electricity Import	Haul Vehicles	Off-road Equipment	Reductions from Waste Diversion	Total contribution to Global greenhouse gases
2013	2,799.0	4.6	670.0	217.0	-1,600.0	2,090.0
2020	3,558.0	5.8	1,106.0	358.0	-2,642.0	2,385.0

The EKAPCD's CEQA Greenhouse Gas Policy considers the Project to have a less than significant impact if project-specific greenhouse gas emissions are less than 25,000 tons per year. The Project does not exceed this threshold as project-specific greenhouse gas emissions are less than 25,000 tons per year. Additionally, the policy requires that the Project demonstrate compliance with AB 32. The Project has potential to provide an overall slight increase of 325 short tons (295 MTCO₂E) of greenhouse gas emissions above the 2013 baseline emissions (Table 4.7-2). However, based upon the system-wide approach described above (4.7.4.2), and the CEQA guidance, it is appropriate to utilize mitigation activities at other waste management facilities to further offset the less than significant greenhouse gas emissions of the Project (See impact 4.7-3).

Furthermore, the Project emissions are based on an inventory with the sole purpose of calculating emissions at the Tehachapi SLF. To remain conservative in the emissions estimate, two major factors were not a part of the inventory: (1) The majority of diversion activities for the Tehachapi area are done prior to waste being transported to the landfill. Therefore, by solely looking at the emissions at the landfill, only a small amount of diversion credit can be accounted. (2) The haul distance would increase considerably if the landfill was to close in 2014. The waste would be transported to the Mojave-Rosamond Recycling and Sanitary Landfill, the Bakersfield Metropolitan (Bena) Sanitary Landfill, or another approved KCWMD facility. Taking in to account these two factors would considerably reduce the greenhouse gas emissions of the Project versus the baseline.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation will be required.

Level of Significance: Impacts are less than significant.

[This Space Intentionally Left Blank]

Landfill. The 2011 inventory accounted for all greenhouse gas emissions associated with waste management in the county. In 2011 it was assumed the Tehachapi Sanitary Landfill would close in 2013, and the waste would be transported from the Tehachapi area to another approved KCWMD facility. The haul distances would increase considerably if the landfill was to close. This Project will allow the landfill to accept waste for another six years. Therefore, taking into account the shorter haul distances compared to transporting the waste to Mojave-Rosamond, the Bakersfield Metropolitan (Bena) Sanitary Landfill, or another KCWMD facility, would further reduce the greenhouse gas emissions below the 1990 goal of AB 32.

**Table 4.7-3
Kern County Waste Management Department
System-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MTCO₂E)**

Year	Methane Emissions	Electricity Import	Haul Vehicles	Off-road Equipment	Light Duty Vehicles	Reductions from Waste Diversion	Total contribution to Global greenhouse gases
1990*	38,488	0	1,158	2,245	238	-431,860	-389,731
2008	32,616	167	865	1,677	523	-476,218	-440,370
2020	39,624	203	1,049	2,035	713	-577,776	-534,152

*AB32 Goal

[This Space Intentionally Left Blank]

As stated under *Significant and Irreversible Impacts*, nonrenewable resources would be utilized primarily in the form of fossil fuels and would include fuel, oil, and gasoline used by equipment associated with the construction of drainage improvements and operations over the extended lifespan. Without implementation of the 2014 Project, these resources would still be expended to handle the waste disposal, whether at this site or another permitted facility. In addition, if the Tehachapi SLF is not expanded, these resources would still be expended to handle waste disposal, whether at the disposal site, transfer station, or another permitted disposal facility. Haul trucks originating in the area served by the Tehachapi SLF would need to travel greater distances to the Bena SLF or Mojave-Rosamond Recycling and Sanitary Landfill as the nearest alternative sites, or another permitted disposal facility, thus requiring the use of additional nonrenewable resources.

Recycling

All of the operating Kern County landfills and transfer stations have designated areas for the diversion of recyclable materials. In 2012 (the most recent year for which diversion data are available), the Unincorporated Kern County diversion rate was 57 percent. The 2012 diversion rates for all Kern County jurisdictions are listed in Table 5-3.

Table 5-3
Diversion Rates for Kern County Jurisdictions
2012

Jurisdiction	Diversion Rate (%)
Arvin	58
Bakersfield	60
California City	61
Delano	63
Kern-Unincorporated	57
Maricopa	57
McFarland	45
Ridgecrest	53
Shafter	83
Taft	75
Tehachapi	70
Wasco	58
Source: CalRecycle, 2012a.	

It should be noted that these rates are not based on the diversion of total 2012 incoming waste levels. As of 2007, California no longer measures diversion rates based on the AB 939 formula, but rather reports per capita disposal rates in compliance with SB 1016, the Per Capita Disposal Measurement System. Therefore, the diversion rates shown in Table 5-3 are an informal calculation using each jurisdiction's 2012 per capita