

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
IRP Steering Group Workshop No. 13
July 7, 2006

MEETING MINUTES

OPENING REMARKS/WELCOME

The Bureau of Sanitation IRP Project Director Adel Hagekhalil welcomed all attendees.

REVIEW OF IRP ALTERNATIVES

Heather Boyle Van Meter, IRP Project Manager, reviewed the four IRP alternatives and any 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.

The following issues were discussed:

- Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer (GBIS): Provides additional capacity in the sewer system. There are two proposed alignments for this sewer system. These two alignments are referred to the North Alignment and the South Alignment. The northern alignment runs through the City of Burbank and ends up in the North Hollywood area whereas the southern alignment runs through the Toluca Lake residential area. The recommended preferred alignment will combine both alignments at specific points. *Please refer to the IRP Steering Group Workshop 13 Handout Slide 21.* By combining both alignments, the issue of impacts associated with the eastern portion of the north alignment as well as contingency response issues and concerns along the western portion of the south alignment, can be addressed.
- North East Interceptor Sewer Phase II (NEIS): There are two proposed alignments. One runs through San Fernando Road and the second runs through the Griffith Park area. The proposed NEIS II Alignment (West Alignment Option B) would provide better constructability and fewer right-of-way acquisitions. *Please refer to the IRP Steering Group Workshop 13 Handout Slide 22.*
- IRP Environmental Impact Report: The draft EIR was circulated for public comments on November 30, 2005. The distribution was as follows: 139 full Draft EIR documents, 149 Executive Summary Documents with compact disks, 219 compact disk copies, and 7,100 Notices of Availability.
- EIR Comments Received: There were a total of 2,767 comment letters received. Of these 26 were from agencies and local municipalities, 22 from organizations, 494 from individuals, over 1,600 form letters, and the remainder from public meetings. Copies of

all comments and responses will be included in the Final EIR. The majority of the comments received on the document were concerning the Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer's Northern and Southern alignments. *Please refer to the IRP Steering Group Workshop 13 Handout Slide 17.*

- The remaining comments dealt with the actual alternatives themselves. *Please refer to the IRP Steering Group Workshop 13 Handout Slide 17.*
- In consideration of the Draft EIR comments, the City of Los Angeles will respond to all comments submitted during the review period and will integrate additional input from public agencies into the Final EIR.
- The Quadrant Analysis was discussed. This analysis compares and contrasts the benefits versus the cost of each alternative. According to the analysis, the following was determined:
 - Alternative 4 has the highest ranking for recycled water, dry weather runoff and wet weather runoff, and potential second choice for wastewater.
 - Alternative 1 has the highest ranking for both wastewater and wet weather runoff.
 - Alternative 2 has the similar recycled water and runoff management benefits as Alternative 4, but at a higher cost. It also provides a low benefit for wastewater.
 - Alternative 3 has moderate recycled water, wastewater and runoff benefits, with similar costs to Alternative 1.

Please refer to the IRP Steering Group Workshop 13 Handout Slide 27.

- Alternative 4 was chosen as the recommended alternative to great extent to its recycled water benefits. Changes in future regulations regarding the use of recycled water or future policy decisions regarding the use of recycled water for groundwater replenishment could reduce these recycled water benefits.

UPDATE ON RELATED ACTIVITIES

Funding Activities (Prop O)

At the workshop, Dr. Shahram Kharaghani, Watershed Protection Division Manager, provided information regarding Proposition "O." The bond provides funding for the City's stormwater program that would help with some of the IRP projects. 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 there is a \$500 Million General Obligation Bond. From this amount, \$250 million will be used for rivers, lakes, beaches, bays and ocean water quality protection projects; \$100 million will be used for flood water reduction, river and neighborhood parks that prevent polluted runoff and improve water quality projects; \$75 million will be used for storm water

capture, clean-up and re-use projects; and \$75 million will be used on water conservation, drinking water and source protection projects.

Mr. Kharaghani also went over the project selection criteria. All projects shall provide water quality improvements, and:

- Meet water quality standards (40%)
- Provide multiple benefits including (30%)
- Project Readiness and Feasibility (30%)

Proposition O Round One “Call for Projects”, produced the following results:

- Five workshops were held in Nov. 2005
- 52 projects were received in Dec. 2005
- Projects were evaluated and placed into
 - A – Project is Prop O eligible (15 projects)
 - B – Project is Prop O eligible but need more info (26 projects)
 - C – Project is not Prop O eligible (11 projects)
- 14 project concept reports are being prepared
- 7 projects are being prepared for construction
- Estimated cost of round one is \$263M

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

Bureau of Street Services Presentation

At the workshop, the Bureau of Street Services provided information regarding their design-build projects as well as pilot projects. Examples of projects that have been completed include: Larchmont Village, Zoo Drive Widening and Alignment Project, and the Figueroa Corridor Streetscape Project.

Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan

At the workshop, Ara Kasparian, Bureau of Engineering, provided information regarding the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan. There have been 5 opportunity sites selected. These include Canoga Park High School, Verdugo Industrial Park, Taylor Yards, Cornfields/LA River State Park, and Downtown Industrial.

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

Implementation and Policy issues:

- Growth control might reduce need for new sewers.
- There is a concern regarding management of grease/food waste products.

Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer (GBIS):

- As far as the GBIS connector, the designs have all been checked for seismic impacts.
- The north alignment of GBIS would impact Burbank residents while the southern alignment would impact the Toluca Lake residents.

- The City of Burbank (COB) has gone on record opposing the GBIS North Alignment and a combined GBIS Alignment that connects the eastern half of the South Alignment with the western half of the North Alignment. The COB would like the GBIS South Alignment or another alignment that avoids their jurisdiction to be implemented.
- Sections of GBIS would be tunneled under the Los Angeles River. At some points these tunnels would reach a depth of 100 to 150 feet.
- It is anticipated that the construction for the GBIS would start in 2011 and would take approximately three to four years to complete.

North East Interceptor Sewer II (NEIS):

- The Pecan Grove area will be closed during construction of NEIS II.
- The west alignment of NEIS II avoids the Superfund area,
- Stakeholders would like to use the term “tunnel” rather than “sewer” when implying depth.
- The reclaimed water line at Griffith Park is already in place.
- Stakeholders were concerned about pipe breakage in the future. Design parameters state that the NEIS II would have a life of about 100 years. Tunnels would be constructed using a very stable reinforced tunnel system. Furthermore, it would be regularly maintained and inspected.

Preferred Alternative:

- The question was asked if Alternative 2 would be less costly in the long run.
- Tillman project will not impact Balboa Park.
- Dry weather flow management benefits runoff water quality as well as reuse.
- Stakeholders suggested more expansive language about benefits of reuse beyond water supply impacts, when communicating the preferred alternative to City Council.
- Alternative 1 is superior in EIR based on impacts, but Alternative 4 is preferred based on the benefits it provides to the City.
- Alternatives should be referred by definition, not numbering.
- Stakeholders wanted to know the plans to publicize availability of recycled water for current uses, excluding infiltration. Department of Water and Power (DWP) is in the process of identifying large potential customers. As of now DWP cannot use recycled water in the San Fernando Valley because there is no permit in effect.

Questions/Comments:

- The Final EIR should be as explicit as possible about the many beneficial benefits of the alternatives.
- Non-potable references should be consistent in the Final EIR. Also, the delivery of the message is very important.
- Is the Hyperion Plant threshold in any way in danger from global climate change and rising ocean levels?
- How much of an increase in sea level would there have to be for Hyperion to be affected?
- Was solar energy incorporated in the Final EIR?
- Why is only half of Thatcher Yard being designed?

ATTACHMENTS

- Workshop No. 13 Agenda
- Integrated Resource Plan – Steering Group Workshop 13 IRP Recommendations PowerPoint
- IRP Recommendations – Working Draft Version 10
- Steering Group Attendance list