

**Attachment B**

**City of Los Angeles  
IRP Steering Group Workshop No. 3  
March 27, 2003**

**FEEDBACK REPORT**

**WATER/RUNNOFF**

- **Minutes Correction for page 3 of the Workshop No. 2 minutes**  
See attachment for amended page 3. The response was changed for the question: “Why is the percentage of groundwater usage (15%) rather low, and who can use it?”
  
- **DWP should consider marketing (bottling) ultra-pure drinking water from the Los Angeles Aqueduct like San Francisco is doing with their source water.**  
Water processed by the Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant is very high-quality water. The source water is one of purest municipal drinking water sources, imported from the Sierra-Nevada Mountains. DWP does bottle water from its Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant for its customers who have emergency water service outages and for promotional reasons only. DWP has no plans at this time to market the bottled water for retail sale. However, as part of future marketing efforts, this may be considered.
  
- **Consider the issue of reducing paving/paving impacts on runoff and ground water supply.**  
This is one of the areas being considered as part of the stormwater/runoff aspect of the IRP. Additionally, permeable asphalt may be a paving option that will be explored further with the Department of Building and Safety and Bureau of Street Services.
  
- **Maintain planned landscaping limits regarding the amount of paving of residential property.**  
The current paving limits for single-family residences requires that no more than 50% of the front yard may be paved. The policy for preventing excessive paving is requiring a variance to pave more than 50% of the front yard. The variance process is provided in the Los Angeles Municipal Code Sec. 12.27 E. There are five (5) findings that must be made in order to approve the request. The most difficult finding to make is that the relief sought is self-imposed and not the result of a city action. The findings should ensure:
  1. that the strict application of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the zoning regulations;
  2. that there are special circumstances applicable to the subject property such as size, shape, topography, location or surroundings that do not apply generally to other property in the same zone and vicinity;
  3. that the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right or use generally possessed by other property in the same zone and

## Attachment B

- vicinity but which, because of the special circumstances and practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships, is denied to the property in question;
4. that the granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare, or injurious to the property or improvements in the same zone or vicinity in which the property is located; and
  5. that the granting of the variance will not adversely affect any element of the General Plan.
- **Emphasize the IPWP guiding principle focused on benefits of using runoff to percolate or recharge the groundwater.**  
This is one of the areas being considered as part of the stormwater/runoff aspect of the IRP.
  - **Consider reducing runoff by requiring new communities to capture and reuse its rainfall runoff (consider safety issues).**  
The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board already has regulations called the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans (SUSMPs) that requires new large developments to retain on-site the runoff produced in the development. The IRP will investigate potential reuse methods and safety issues associated with stormwater reuse.

## WASTEWATER

- **Consider decentralized approach to wastewater treatment.**  
The IRP will consider both centralized and decentralized alternatives.

## FACILITY SITING CRITERIA

- **Incorporate green waste/mulch in planning.**  
The City currently reuses 100% of its green waste. Most is converted to mulch and used on City parks and plantings.
- **Incorporate land use/open space in planning.**  
The IRP will investigate the options of siting multi-use facilities that will incorporate open space and/or recreational areas.
- **What is the policy for maintaining open spaces?**  
The policy for maintaining open-space is a state law. State law requires that the general plan contain the following seven elements and that they be internally consistent:
  1. Land Use element designates the general location and intensity of housing, business, industry, open-space, education, public buildings, waste disposal and other land uses;
  2. Circulation;
  3. Conservation;
  4. Housing;

## Attachment B

5. Noise;
6. Open-Space details plans and measures for preserving open-space for natural resources. The managed production of resources, outdoor recreation, public health and safety and the identification of agricultural land; and
7. Safety.

## FINANCIAL

- **Does the State's financial situation impact funding sources?**

The State's projected \$35(+)billion deficit will not affect any wastewater or stormwater project funding that the Bureau of Sanitation expects to come from the State. This money is bond-funded through propositions and the State Revolving Fund Loan and has a dedicated source of funds available. The Bureau of Sanitation is submitting Prop 13 and Prop 50 proposals for 23 wastewater and stormwater projects, including nitrogen removal at the D.C. Tillman and the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plants; the next phase of the Advanced Wastewater Treatment Facility at the Terminal Island Treatment Plant; river and urban lakes enhancement; low flow diversions; and wetlands throughout the City.
- **Show the history of increase in Sewer Facility Charge**

The Sewerage Facilities Charge (SFC) is a one-time charge to "buy-in" to the sewer and wastewater treatment system capacity. For a historical prospective, please refer to the attached SFC History graph. Please note that on July 1, 1989, the City changed the methodology used to determine the SFC from the system buy-in method to the incremental cost-pricing method. On April 1996, the City changed the methodology back to the system buy-in method. These changes in the SFC were due to the available system capacity. The system buy-in method is best suited when there is adequate capacity to serve new customers. The incremental cost-pricing method is appropriate when a significant portion of the facilities needed to serve new customers must be provided by the construction on new facilities.
- **Show history of the actual net revenues so we can compare them with the graph for the Sewer Service Charges history.**

A graph showing the history of the Wastewater Fund's net revenues from 1989 to 2002 is attached.
- **Why do the pie charts presenting the Wastewater CIP Funding Sources show an increase in the percentage of bonds and commercial papers from 41% in 1998-2002 to 59% for 2003-2007?**

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the citizens of Los Angeles approved \$3.5 billion of bonds to help fund the wastewater program. The City has been selling the bonds over the years as needed to fund the capital improvements. There is about \$1 billion remaining bonding capacity, and for the next five years, the City will sell more of these bonds. Because the City has not had a rate increase in 11 years, the City needs to finance more projects rather than paying from the cash accounts.

## Attachment B

- **If stormwater is treated in wastewater facilities, can you charge for it? Are there opportunities for funding alternatives?**  
For the low-flow diversions, the City does not charge Sewer Facility Charges (a one-time charge to “buy-in” to the sewer and wastewater treatment system capacity) because the diversions occur during the dry season and use otherwise unused treatment and conveyance capacity, so there is no need to “buy-in” to the system. However, the Stormwater Program is liable for Sewer Service Charges, the charges for the operation and maintenance of the wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities.
- **Why not look at DWP funding?**  
DWP presently funds aggressive water recycling and water conservation programs. The IRP will also investigate nontraditional funding methods to finance the integrated alternatives, such as interagency agreements where affected agencies (including DWP) would provide funds proportional to the benefits that would be realized by each agency. For more information regarding DWP’s Water Services funding, please refer to the attached Financial Statement for the Department of Water and Power’s Water Services, which can also be found at: [http://www.ladwp.com/finance/water\\_fs\\_fy02.pdf](http://www.ladwp.com/finance/water_fs_fy02.pdf)
- **The 2002 Wastewater Operating Revenues and break-down percentages reported in the workshop were revised after the workshop, and the revised information is provided in the attached slide.**

### GENERAL

- **Concern about the City Council approving \$1.2 million, which will come out the wastewater fund, to retain an outside law firm to defend against a law suit filed by the EPA, State, environmental and neighborhood groups for violating sewer spills and order complaints**  
The City has committed to spending about \$2.5 billion over the next 10 years to help prevent sewer overflows due to rain and blockages and alleviate sewer order problems. The City has been sued for a liability of \$550 million for past sewer overflows. The lawsuit is now in discovery and disclosure. The City is required by law to respond to discovery and disclosure and to provide information and briefs in a very short period of time as directed by the Court. The City Attorney’s office does not have staff available to perform the necessary legal work. In order to comply with the Court’s deadlines and to be responsive to the plaintiffs, the City must seek outside counsel. The commitment of the City and the Bureau of Sanitation is to settle this case and move forward with the business of service to the citizens of Los Angeles. The City is currently in negotiations for a fair settlement for the citizens of Los Angeles, and the \$1.2 million will help to ensure compliance with the Court’s deadlines and to achieve a fair settlement.