

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
IRP Steering Group Workshop No. 12
October 20, 2005

MEETING MINUTES

OPENING REMARKS/WELCOME

The Bureau of Sanitation IRP Project Director Adel Hagekhalil welcomed all attendees and introduced the new Board of Public Works Commissioner Paula Daniels. The Commissioner expressed excitement and enthusiasm about the IRP.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

Since the previous Steering Group workshop about one year ago, the IRP team has been busy working on developing the draft environmental impact report (EIR) for the IRP. Some of the Steering Group members commented that they would like to meet more often and be actively involved in the EIR process and selection of the preferred alternative. They also want policy changes to ensure successful implementation of the IRP. Commissioner Paula Daniels suggested the formation of a sub-committee to review and plan for policy alignment among various departments to help with the IRP implementation. A sign-up sheet was distributed for interested parties. Adel discussed potentially holding annual workshops to monitor the implementation of the IRP. As budget constraints allow, we will try to have more frequent Steering group workshops in the future.

UPDATE ON RELATED ACTIVITIES

Mayor's Initiatives and Appointments

In November 2005, the City elected Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa. The Mayor has made some new appointments, including appointing Cynthia Ruiz as Board of Public Works President, and Paula Daniels and Board of Public Works Commissioner.

Funding Activities (Prop O)

At the workshop, Dr. Shahram Kharaghani, Watershed Protection Division Manager, provided information regarding Proposition "O." He indicated that the IRP staff and stakeholders were instrumental in the passage of the bond measure during the City of Los Angeles, November 2, 2004 successful General Election. The bond provides funding for the City's stormwater program that would help with some of the IRP projects.

He indicated that the City of Los Angeles Proposition O Citizens Oversight Advisory Committee and the Department of Public Works have been encouraging non-profit and community organizations to submit their ideas for water quality improvement projects. A series of workshops were held in November 2005 and were great opportunity for dialog between City

project planners and communities to discuss projects that improve water quality. The nominated projects that are approved by the City's Department of Public Works (DPW) will also be designed and built by DPW with Proposition O funds.

He encouraged IRP stakeholders to attend scheduled Proposition O workshops and to submit projects for their neighborhoods. The types of projects that could be eligible for Proposition O funding include:

- Stormwater cleanup, control, and diversion
- Water quality, pollution, and bacterial control
- Trash capture
- Urban lakes and bay improvements
- Habitat/wetlands restoration and development
- Stormwater retention facilities / parks /greenbelts
- Water conservation / reuse facilities

He pointed out that specific examples of the projects that would be eligible for Proposition O funding and implementation include:

- Augustus F. Hawkins Park. This park has wetlands habitat that is comprised of a freshwater marsh wetlands and surrounding riparian vegetation. The wetlands provide multiple benefits including treatment of non-point source pollution, wildlife habitat, recreation, and education.
- Open Charter Elementary School Cistern Project in Westchester
- Sun Valley Park Pilot Project.

Stakeholders interested in more Proposition O information can visit the website at www.LAstormwater.org.

Dr. Kharaghani also discussed that the RFP for Proposition 50 grant is expected to be released soon, will consist of \$1.5 million for planning and \$30 million for implementation.

Desalination in LA

Tom Erb from DWP mentioned that the Urban water management plan is wrapping up and that opportunities for on-site stormwater infiltration are addressed in the plan.

Members of the Steering Group made suggestions to improve communication among various agencies and City departments, including the concept of integrating the various "integrated plans," including LA River Revitalization Master Plan, Proposition "O" and Proposition 50. As a result, IRP staff agreed to provide the Steering Group members with updates of these parallel programs and others as appropriate.

Note: the update is provided below, in part, by the attached coordinated schedule of these various programs as compiled by and received from staff of the LA River Revitalization Task Force. Additionally, we have included with this minutes a flyer inviting you and your families to a series of public meetings for the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan, entitled, "Design the River of your Dreams," that will be held on January 21, 24 and 28, 2006.

REVIEW OF IRP ALTERNATIVES

The IRP Project schedule, related efforts such as funding activities (Proposition 50 and Proposition (O)), and desalination in Los Angeles were discussed. Heather Boyle VanMeter, IRP Project Manager, reviewed the four IRP alternatives and changes made to the alternatives:

- Alternative 1 - Hyperion expansion, moderate potential for water resources projects,
- Alternative 2 - Tillman and LAG expansion, high potential for water resources projects,
- Alternative 3 - Tillman expansion, moderate potential for water resources projects, and
- Alternative 4 - Tillman expansion, high potential for water resources projects.

These alternatives reflect a full spectrum of wastewater assumptions, provide leadership in water resources and balance today's financial realities. All alternatives will increase water conservation by installing "smart irrigation", divert coastal dry weather runoff to the sewer for treatment, and treat/reuse dry weather runoff from Ballona Creek and Compton Creek.

Ms. VanMeter also discussed changes to the EIR project description:

- Recycled Water: During the public comment period on the Notice of Preparation for the EIR, the City received comments requesting that groundwater recharge using recycled water be analyzed in the EIR. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an EIR to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to a project. In accordance with CEQA, the City will evaluate groundwater recharge using recycled water on a conceptual level in the EIR.1 Site specific projects for the use of groundwater recharge of recycled water will have their own future CEQA documents.
- Storage at Tillman: After the severe rain conditions in the winter of 2005, it was determined that additional wastewater conveyance operational flexibility was needed. To provide operational flexibility and storage, underground wet weather storage tanks at Tillman were included in all alternatives, in addition to a new Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer (VSLIS). Previously, either a new sewer or new storage were included in all alternatives (not both).
- Secondary Clarifiers at Hyperion: To provide operational improvements at Hyperion additional secondary clarifiers were added to all alternatives.

PREVIEW OF DRAFT EIR

CEQA and the EIR requirements as it relates to the IRP were discussed. The IRP EIR process includes Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft-EIR public review/public comment; evaluation of the four alternatives and the no project option; determination of the preferred alternative; final EIR; and the approval process through the Board of Public Works/DWP Board of Commissioners, and the City Council.

The IRP EIR evaluates impacts from project-level components and program level components. The following are examples of the Project-Level components in the IRP EIR:

- Hyperion expansion
- Tillman expansion

- Los Angeles Glendale (LAG) expansion:
- Tillman storage
- Two major interceptor sewers: Northeast Interceptor Sewer Phase 2 (NEIS-II) and Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer (GBIS).

Program-Level components include runoff management features, recycled water elements and Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer (VSLIS).

Suggestions, Questions, Action Items and Concerns Expressed at the Workshop

Implementation and Policy issues:

- Ensure that Departmental policy changes incorporate integration.
- Get Departments to make changes to underlying strategies for stormwater.
- Identify the “low-hanging fruits,” on the leadership projects and address policy issues for integration.
- Inform, reach out and involve land developers in attaining IRP integration goals.
- There is a need to integrate planning and zoning with the IRP.
- Excessive paving is still a concern within the City of Los Angeles.
- Stakeholders would like to meet more often and provide input to City decisions.
- FOG spills are down by 80%, other spills are down by 50%
- We should all share cost increases uniformly.

Water comments:

- Desalination
 - Must be cost effective
 - Marginal cost should be borne by new developments/residents
 - Disagreement – we are all in this together
 - Still has environmental impacts
- We are concerned that Sunshine Canyon landfill is located over LA’s water supply (aquifer).
- Learn from Huntington Beach’s pilot plant on desalination.
- Need to revisit Ground Water Recharge (GWR) as a feasible option that saves money.

Alignment with other Projects:

- LA River Revitalization Master Plan
 - Needs to integrate with the IRP, CREST and other plans.
 - Needs to have better publicity and outreach to the Neighborhood Councils.
 - Needs to be stakeholder driven.

Alternatives/Project Description:

- Are we enabling growth? Any limits on capacity? [- There is a “no-project “ IRP alternative, but the City must plan for accommodating growth.]
- How much redundancy is built into these alternatives? Is one alternative better than another? Provide provisions for flexibility.
- How much flexibility are in the alternatives?
 - Redundancy is built in to some extent. For example the Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer (VSLIS) provides biggest flexibility in the system
- Have we addressed security concerns at plants? Security upgrades are happening at this time.
- Have we considered expanding the tunnel (La Cienega San Fernando Valley Relief Sewer) instead of around horn (GBIS and NEIS)?
- Ensure that runoff management options are in alignment with implementation plans.
- Keep in mind flooding concerns with regard to keeping the concrete out.
- Be careful about flood protection in seeking stormwater solutions.
- Instead of smart irrigation, address native plant options, less maintenance issues, etc.
- How is the Groundwater recharge (GWR) included in the IRP alternatives? Don't mix groundwater recharge with other uses of reclaimed water.
- Differentiate between wastewater GWR and runoff GWR.
- Does this finalize TWRP's options to expand?
- Is underground storage the way the City proposes to go in the future? Will there be more to come?
- Consider TWRP storage inside current footprint, under existing facilities, i.e. parking lots, etc.
- Consider two 30 MG storage tanks instead of one 60 MG storage tank.
- What is common to all IRP alternatives?
 - Biosolids treatment at Hyperion, all are integrated alternatives, have conservation options, and leadership projects.
 - Provide summary sheet of the four IRP alternatives and a list of differences among them.

Process Questions/Comments

- Will EIR comments be addressed or just included in the FEIR? Any obligation to respond?
 - Environmental Impacts/comments need to be addressed, but not non-environmental.
- Can Steering Group weigh in on comments before preferred alternative is developed and help provide consensus on defining preferred alternative?
- How does this group get involved after this process, i.e. after FEIR certification? Use Steering Group Committee to provide input into FEIR and the preferred alternative. Stakeholders should be involved in comment process and building consensus on preferred alternative. Get Steering Group members involved and act as ambassadors, past IRP completion.

- The 60-days review period for DEIR is insufficient. We need at least 90-days review period in light of the upcoming holidays.
- How are lead agencies involved in the EIR process? Other agencies such as Army Corps, Coastal Commission can use the IRP EIR provisions as criteria in issuing their permits.
- Integrate DWP's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Neighborhood Councils (NCs) into the IRP.
- Selection of one alternative such as expanding Tillman does not preclude Hyperion in the future.
- Update the sustainability chart presented at the last workshop to read or agree with DEIR.

EIR UPDATES SINCE THE WORKSHOP

The following are some of the Draft-IRP EIR activities that have taken place since the workshop, which we would like to share with you as a means of keeping you informed of the on-going progress in these areas until the next IRP workshop is held. First we would like to announce that the Draft-EIR was issued on November 30, 2005, requesting your comments, and that it could be accessed at our website: <http://www.lacity.org/san/irp/index.htm> . Your comments to the EIR could be provided on-line at the following website: <http://www.lacity-irp.org/Draft-EIR-Comments.htm>

The draft EIR is available for public review and comment for a period of 90 days beginning on Thursday, December 1, 2005 and ending on Monday, February 27, 2006, and that the environmental issue areas, which could be commented on include, but not limited to: aesthetics, air quality, noise, geology & soil, water quality, environmental justice, hazardous materials, population & housing, public services, recreation, and traffic. Environmental effects will be assessed and mitigation measures will be reviewed during the EIR process in selection of the preferred alternative.

Second, that copies of the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the IRP Draft-EIR were mailed, on November 30, 2005 to more than 6000 people in the cities of Los Angeles, Glendale, Burbank, and other contract agencies. The NOAs were mailed in both English and Spanish to people and businesses along and near the proposed sewer alignments (NEIS-II & GBIS), near wastewater treatment plants, and near other Project-Level components of the IRP's EIR. The NOA contains the schedule for the Draft EIR public hearings and other related information. A CD copy of the Draft-EIR and the NOA were mailed to all IRP Steering Group members. We have included a copy of the NOA for your reference, should you not have received a copy by now.

Third, that the following IRP Draft EIR Public Hearings are being held at the following locations, dates and times:

| | |
|--|--|
| San Fernando Valley Area Van Nuys City Hall 6262 Van Nuys Blvd. Van Nuys, CA 91401 Wednesday, January 4, 2006 @7:00 p.m. | Central Los Angeles Area DWP – John Ferraro Building 111 N. Hope St. Los Angeles, CA 90012 Wednesday, January 11, 2006 @10:00 a.m. |
| West Los Angeles Area Council District 11 7166 W. Manchester Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90045 Saturday, January 7, 2006 @11:00 a.m. | Los Angeles Zoo Witherbee Auditorium 5333 Zoo Drive Los Angeles, CA 90027 Thursday, January 12, 2006 @6:00 p.m. |

ATTACHMENTS

- Workshop No. 12 Agenda
- Workshop No. 12c Handout
- Proposition O – Call for Projects
- The LA River Revitalization Master Plan – Public Meeting Announcement
- The LA River Revitalization Coordination Schedule
- Notice of Availability (NOA) for the IRP Draft EIR
- Steering Group Attendance list
- Staff Attendance list