

Attachment B

City of Los Angeles IRP Steering Group Workshop No. 8 November 5 & 13, 2003

FEEDBACK REPORT

RED GROUP (Facilitator -Paul Brown / Presenter-Dan Rodrigo)

- 1. Explain the difference between the Sub-Objectives shown in red and those shown in bold black print.**

All alternatives will equally meet the sub-objectives shown in red. The sub-objectives shown in bold black will be met differently by each alternative and are assigned specific performance measures to gauge the differences.

- 2. What are the differences between “a” and “b” in the High Beneficial Uses of Water Resources (WR) alternatives?**

For the WR1, the difference between “a” and “b” is that “b” has the groundwater recharge option (using treated wastewater) for water recycling. For WR2 and WR3, the difference between “a” and “b” is that the “b” alternatives have diversion to urban runoff plant or wetlands and beneficially use option (URP) for the Dry Weather Urban Runoff component, as well as meeting irrigation/industry demands using treated runoff for the Recycled Water component.

- 3. For the chart that ranks the alternatives against the wastewater system efficiency index, does the index include sewer rehabilitation or only new sewers?**

Only the new sewers and additional treatment capacity required to meet the projected growth were considered in the index. The index did not consider sewer rehabilitation.

- 4. What do you mean by “target” in terms of wet weather urban runoff managed?**

To comply with regulations, the City estimates that we will have to manage the first ½ inch of each rain event. A ½ inch rain event produces 1,700 million gallons of runoff which is the maximum amount of runoff the IRP proposes to manage..

- 5. For the performance measure “Amount of dry and wet weather runoff beneficially used”, the amount of runoff beneficially used by each alternative is shown in acre-feet per year, but the amount of runoff managed is given in million gallons. What is the comparison between acre-feet per year and million gallons per day?**

One million gallons per day equals 1120 acre-feet per year, or one acre-foot equals about 326,000 Gallons.

- 6. For the performance measure “Average single-family monthly cost for water, wastewater, and stormwater”, do you assume that the consumers will pay for all of the costs.**

Yes. The chart shows the combined average monthly cost to consumers if all costs were passed on to the consumers, but the chart does not indicate who will actually pay for the

costs. The chart is used to compare the cost of each alternative, not to show who will pay the bill.

7. For the performance measure “Potential for external funding”, how did you determine which alternatives had higher potential and which had low potential for external funding?

We performed an extensive study of all types of funding available (State and Federal Grants and loans) and the granting requirements to determine which IRP options would have the highest potential for external funding.

8. How can you be confident about the second step of the process of scoring the alternatives (calculating the satisfaction level especially the y-axis)?

The shape of the satisfaction level line is important in scoring of the alternatives. The second part of the surveys (the Performance Preferences survey) was used to determine the shape of the line. The values on the x-axis come from detailed technical analysis, and the y-axis is always 0 to 10.

9. It is amazing that Alternative HA1 is clearly the direction that is emerging.

While HA1 seems to be the most preferred alternative at this time, an even better alternative can be developed by grouping some of the better performing options from the preliminary alternatives. Developing 4 or 5 hybrid alternatives will be the next step in the IRP process.

10. For the next set of alternatives, will one be a no project alternative to satisfy the environmental impact reports?

The next phase of the IRP will be the EIR/EIS development which require 4 alternatives and one no project alternative. The IRP will present 4 hybrid alternatives plus one no project alternative in the EIR/EIS documents.

11. Some of the terms used in the surveys were defined differently than the way I define them so my survey results are not accurate. If the definitions were known before we completed the surveys, the rankings might have been different.

If the survey results are not accurate, we want you to redo the surveys knowing how the terms are defined. The surveys are not intended to trap you into something you do not agree with. Remember that the outcome of the surveys is not the final decision, but only a guideline to develop hybrid alternatives.

12. I like all of the alternatives equally so I think it’s wrong to try to rank them.

The purpose of the IRP is to develop a preferred plan for the future. In order to select 4 or 5 hybrid alternatives for the EIR/EIS process where the preferred alternative will emerge, we have to have a system to rank the alternatives.

13. The definitions were clear to me, but as Steering Group members, aren’t we supposed to guide the team in selecting the alternatives that are best for the community?

Yes. This type of methodology is frequently applied to evaluation of plans and projects, but what makes the IRP different is that we are not just averaging the results. Using feedback from the Steering Group, the IRP technical team will create a series of Hybrid Alternatives that will combine the best elements from the top ranking preliminary alternatives to improve overall performance.

GREEN GROUP (Facilitator –Kelli Burn-Roy / Presenter-Scott Lynch)

- 1. What is the difference between the red and black print on the Sub-Objectives?**
The red print is for the Sub-Objectives that did not distinguish a difference between alternatives. The Sub-Objectives printed in black are the ones that vary between alternatives and have specific performance measures to compare the alternatives.
- 2. What do you mean by enhance public lands?**
Enhancing public lands means to convert vacant lots, alleys, and other degraded land into more valuable/useable land for the public.
- 3. Would maintaining open space be considered enhance public lands?**
No. The focus is on increasing green space in Los Angeles. The IRP is looking at ways of incorporating multi-benefit uses that may include placement of underground facilities with an above-ground park or open space.
- 4. Is there an issue regarding how much suspended solids are needed in the runoff to replenish the beaches (sand replenishment) when you're looking at water quality?**
No, this is not an issue. The design of the current stormdrain system prevents any significant amount of sediment from being deposited on the beach. Total suspended solids is simply an "indicator" pollutant selected to measure the reduction in total pollutants conveyed to the ocean. The less suspended solids entering our watersheds, the cleaner our beaches and oceans will be.
- 5. If the regulations aren't set yet, how did you decide what targeted amount of stormwater will have to be managed?**
The Santa Monica Bay (SMB) beaches dry and wet weather bacterial total maximum daily load (TMDL) regulation was issued last year, and is being used as the basis of assumption by the IRP technical team as to the minimum amount of wet weather runoff that needs to be managed in order to be in compliance with these limits. This initial assumption was based on managing runoff from a ½ inch rain event, as a starting point to achieving compliance. To calculate the amount of stormwater that would have to be managed Citywide, we assumed that the same SMB wet weather bacterial TMDL regulation requirements would be applied to the other receiving waters. There are three types of regulations we are looking at in the IRP: existing, emerging, and future (crystal ball) regulations.
- 6. In the alternatives that use the option of groundwater recharge, did you consider how much the basins can be recharged without contaminating the basins from landfills and other pollutants that exists at higher ground levels?**
Yes, we considered the safe yield of the groundwater basins when calculating the amount of recharge for each alternative that uses the recharge option.
- 7. How will the cost for the businesses correspond to the residential cost that you showed?**
The cost to business and industry will increase by the same percentages shown for residential customers.

8. For comparing the costs, are you assuming a straight line extrapolation in cost and an elastic demand so that when the costs go up you don't consider that people will use less and business will move out of the City?

Yes, we are only looking at the costs relative to what residents currently pay just to compare the cost of the alternatives. A more detailed financial analysis that will consider rate impacts will be conducted later in the process.

9. Since the City is going to have to pay so much money to accommodate the growth, why don't we have an option that restricts growth?

By law, the IRP must plan for the growth that is projected by SCAG. There are other avenues that you can use to address growth concerns, like through the Department of City Planning, but in the IRP arena, we must plan to accommodate the growth that is projected to occur in 2020. The growth that is being projected is not a dramatic increase. It is essentially the birth rate of 1% per year. Also, meeting the more stringent regulations is the major driver in the high costs of the alternatives. The costs associated in meeting the growth issues are minor in comparison.

10. What progress has been made in aligning the policies of the other departments with the goals of the IRP.

The IRP team has established an Inter-Departmental coordination effort to discuss practices, policies, directions and potential barriers as they relate to the goals of the IRP. The Mayor's Office and various Council offices are working together with us in this effort.

11. How many census tracks are there in the entire City?

The City of Los Angeles has 865 census tracks.

12. What do you mean by the term proxy?

The word proxy was only used in terms of the environmental justice run. It refers to the process used to take a "quick look" at how many neighborhoods the different alternatives are impacting, in order to compare the alternatives against each other. The "proxy" is not the type of complete environmental justice evaluation that occurs in the environmental documentation stage of the project.

13. What portion of the Steering Group submitted the surveys?

60 Steering Group members submitted the surveys. There are 90 Steering Group members who have attended one or more of the workshops, and there is a total of 120 Steering Group members. So 2/3 (66%) of the active members and 1/2 (50%) of the total members submitted the surveys.

14. How much effort was put into getting the surveys back?

The weighting objectives survey was distributed in workshop No. 3 on March 27, 2003, and the performance preferences survey was distributed in workshop No. 4 on May 22, 2003. On July 31, 2003, the surveys were mailed to all Steering Group members who had not returned their surveys along with a letter requesting them to return the surveys. Also, phone calls were placed to the Steering Group members asking them to return the surveys. After workshop 8 on November 7, 2003, we mailed the surveys to all Steering Group members again and made follow-up phone calls during the week of December 8, 2003. Then on December 24, 2003, we mailed the surveys to all members who had not returned them, and

on January 8, 2004, we made follow-up phone calls to the members who informed us that they were going to return the surveys reminding them to return them.

BLUE GROUP (Facilitator –Adel Hagekhalil / Presenter-Heather Boyle)

1. What methods are used to accomplish 100% urban runoff managed?

Only the Low Risk 1 (LR1) alternative manages 100% dry and wet weather runoff. This is based on the assumption that we will only manage the first ½ inch of each storm event (1.7 billion gallons). Methods of managing this runoff include one or a combination of the following: diversion to a wastewater system, diversion to an Urban Runoff Plant or wetlands, implementation of local/neighborhood solutions (i.e. smart irrigation, percolation and/or treatment at new or redevelopment areas, installation of cisterns, neighborhood recharge, etc.) For LR1, we are not yet looking at costs. The preferred alternative will address costs which will be incorporated into the Financial Plan. The cost for LR1 is high due to the large number of runoff treatment facilities needed to treat 100% of a ½ inch storm event.

2. Is there an alternative that considers residential retrofits to capture and reuse runoff?

Yes, the high beneficial use of water resources alternatives (WR1, 2 & 3) are maximizing the on-site percolation and cistern installations in the local neighborhoods.

3. How can we tell which alternatives have new treatment facilities for runoff?

Under dry weather urban runoff solutions, the alternatives that show URP (urban runoff plant) and under wet weather urban runoff the alternatives that are marked for the runoff treatment and beneficial use/discharge options are the alternatives that have runoff treatment facilities.

4. Why are there no URPs under LR1?

Because it is less risky to divert the dry weather runoff to the wastewater system than to site, build and find customers for a new facility(ies).

5. Would all dry weather urban runoff diversion go to HTP in LR1?

Yes. For LR1 the dry weather urban runoff will be treated at the Hyperion Treatment Plant or another upstream wastewater facility.

6. Why is the alternative LCMR scoring zero on the performance measure “Amount of dry and wet weather runoff beneficially used” for the “Enhance the efficient use of natural resources” subobjective?

The LCMR will have some runoff beneficially used, but that amount is considered the baseline, so the chart on Slide 23 only shows the amount above this baseline.

7. For the dry weather urban runoff that is diverted to the wastewater system, what do Title 22 plants do during wet weather?

Title 22 is a level of treatment required to produce recycled water. Currently, when there is no demand for the recycled water, the effluent is discharged to the Los Angeles River. However, in the future, if the upstream plant, i.e. LAG is faced with a more stringent

discharge permit, the effluent will be discharged back into the collection system or held in storage tanks or bypassed around the upstream plants for treatment at Hyperion.

8. Are Title 22 plants currently illegally discharging to the River during wet weather?

No. At this time, the regulations permit discharge to the Los Angeles River. But the emerging regulations may prohibit Title 22 effluent from discharging to the river. Therefore, in creating the alternatives, we assume no Title 22 effluent will be discharged to the Los Angeles River.

9. You can irrigate during wet weather as long as it does not run off the property.

There is some amount, before the ground becomes completely saturated, that you can irrigate even while it is raining, but for comparing the alternatives, we made a simplified assumption that no irrigation will occur in wet weather.

10. Have other seasonal factors for air quality, ie, air conditioning been considered?

No.

11. How is energy consumption associated with cisterns.

To use the cistern water for irrigation, you have to have a small pump which uses energy, and the energy consumption adds up when a lot of cisterns are installed across the City.

12. The runoff in the upper watershed is not contaminated and is currently being channeled to the ocean. It would be cheaper to acquire land for capture and reuse of the upper watershed runoff than to build treatment plants further downstream.

Los Angeles County has current spreading ground conditions that impact ability to infiltrate more water upstream but is considering acquiring nearby gravel pits for additional and expanded groundwater infiltration. The Sun Valley Stormwater Project is also addressing upper watershed runoff capture and beneficial use.

13. When you show the average monthly single-family cost, who do you assume pays the cost?

The chart shows the combined monthly cost to consumers if all costs were passed on to the consumers, but the chart does not indicate who will actually pay for the costs. The chart is used to compare the cost of each alternative, not to show who will pay the bill. Who pays the cost will be determined in the Financial Plan phase of the IRP.

14. Is first flush captured and is that taken into consideration in WR2b?

The concept in creating the alternatives focused on the target of managing some to all of the first ½ inch of each storm. However, due to our region's great variability in both the number of rain events and the intensity of each rain event, the first flush volume has not been accurately determined. For some rain events the first half-inch is adequate, for others it may not be. This question stills needs a lot of scientific study to define the so-called first flush of a rain event. Some alternatives manage more and others manage less of the target. Therefore, managing the first flush of each storm event is automatically built into each of the alternatives.

15. Is the cost-benefit of relying less on imported water incorporated in the analysis?

The cost benefit of less imported water is incorporated in two ways. We calculated the savings from reduced purchases of imported water in the charts that compare the costs of the

alternatives. It is also incorporated based on how the Steering Group weighted the importance of water self-sufficiency.

16. How did you account for population growth in the cost per single-family households calculation?

In calculating the monthly cost per single-family households, we did consider the increase in population i.e. the total cost was divided by the projected population. Also, see response for question 13.

YELLOW GROUP (Facilitator – Paul Gustafson / Presenter-Scott Lynch)

1. Scores don't match some stakeholder's values – Suggestions of follow up ranking on Alternatives?

In general, Steering Group members have expressed their agreement with the results of the analysis, although there are some cases where disagreement is clear or some questions needed to be answered. The responses from stakeholders on the “weighting objectives” survey were collected to rank the alternatives. There are expected differences on individual preferences on the subject alternatives. This process works just as the initial screening tool for adopting options and alternatives. Hybrid alternatives derived from these initial studies, combine the best elements from the top ranking preliminary alternatives. These alternatives will go through an extensive EIR process and will be driven by a broad stakeholder process, and then the approval process from the regulators.

2. Review procedure for scoring – Error?

We are open to specific feedback on procedures to score and rank the alternatives. However, the current procedures we have employed are deemed to be reliable and acceptable by most technical and stakeholder reviews. The scoring procedure used is as follows:

The technical team provides information about performance of the alternative with respect to each objective. Then, this information is used to translate the performance into a score that reflects the level of satisfaction that the alternative provides by accomplishing the objective. Next, we multiply the level in which the alternative accomplishes a given objective by the weight or the relative importance of that objective.

The above steps are repeated for each objective and performance measure, and, then, we will add all the results to obtain the total score of the alternative. Finally, we will compare each alternative to one another.

The IRP team has offered one-on-one sessions with any of the stakeholders who want to go over their results and/or scoring in more detail. Additionally, if stakeholders feel that their scores do not represent their position, they can resubmit the surveys.

3. How is this project impacting future rain events/ hard ships? (like yesterday's flooding)

Runoff management is an integral part of our alternative analysis. A review of different alternatives shows that the level of runoff management has a direct effect on the associated

costs and the utility rates. An acceptable increase in rate would yield a reasonable success in total runoff management while preventing some of the hardship.

4. Reconsider ½” rain (compared to yesterday’s rain)

We can only use historical averages to accomplish an alternative that targets a manageable runoff volume, reasonable cost and has been defined by our regulators. We have made an assumption that the half-inch used by the State in the Santa Monica Bay Wet Weather Bacteria TMDL (the first of the wet weather TMDL’s) will be used basin-wide on all of the remaining wet weather TMDL’s that State needs to develop. If it isn’t, than we will have to revisit our assumptions and revise our planning efforts.

5. Consider “flood control” aspects of runoff mgmt

This comment will be forwarded to the technical team for consideration in the IRP.

6. Hybrids should combine some elements of WR, HA, & MD alternatives – especially land conservation concepts.

Hybrids alternatives will be constructed using the most desirable elements of those alternatives selected in our initial screening process.

7. Consider new development dual plumbing – recycled or gray water

This comment will be forwarded to the technical team of the IRP for further review. Planning, Building and Safety, and other City Departments will be discussing the feasibility of these options through the Inter-Departmental Coordination meetings.

8. Add a “politically safe” alternative – sellable

Ultimately, an alternative that is fiscally prudent and deemed feasible by the City and by the stakeholders through the EIR process and complies with the regulations will be presented for adoption by Council and approval from the regulators.

9. Consider conducting an “optimizing” analysis

The IRP process and EIR procedures utilize optimizing analyses for selection and recommendation of a preferred alternative.

10. Add elements to one alternative and do a cost/benefit

Development of hybrid alternatives look at cost efficiency as an objective, and the hybrid alternatives compare the costs versus the benefits of each of the alternatives.

11. Need to internally “sell” policies to other City Departments such as Building and Safety, CLA, Mayor’s Office, etc. – Take it Seriously – Get buy-in NOW so don’t refuse LATER – (e.g. Proposition K example w/boe/er)

All affected sectors of the City and outside agencies are involved early-on in the IRP process through periodic meetings such as the monthly Management Advisory Committee (MAC), Steering Group Workshops, Board of Public Works briefings, Council briefings, Inter-Departmental Coordination meetings, LAUSD Coordination meetings, Neighborhood Councils presentation, and other planned events. We understand that buy-in from all of our fellow agencies is an essential part to the overall success and eventual implementation of the IRP.

12. Have meetings with neighborhood council representatives to develop implementation strategy.

The IRP Public Outreach team conducts meetings at the Advisory Group sessions and are pro-actively in touch with different neighborhood councils by presenting the IRP goals and planning at these meetings. To date, the IRP team has presented at 10 NC meetings in addition to the 33 NC's that have representatives in the IRP Stakeholder groups. This outreach effort has significantly added to our overall stakeholder participation in the IRP.

13. Smaller discussion groups are effective in that they allow for more interaction.

The IRP process continues to use all different forums from very large public gatherings to one-on-one sessions to get feedback, buy-in, or partnering of all affected parties.

14. Clarify monthly water/wastewater/stormwater rate – the \$60 value seems to be low.

The single-family cost for water, wastewater and stormwater was derived from current DWP and other City databases. Customers do not see such a monthly bill, since water, wastewater and stormwater are all billed separately, and by different means (bi-monthly utility bills, and annual property tax bills). Please note, this is the average for the entire City; the monthly bills could be higher or lower from one household to another. Also, those utility bills that are sent bi-monthly or quarterly, etc. are normalized to show the average monthly rate.

15. Is inflation built into cost on the chart showing the “Average Cost per Month” for “Single-Family Cost for Water, Wastewater and Stormwater?”

Yes; the current charge of about \$60 per month for water, wastewater, and stormwater is based on the 2003 dollar values. The rest of the bar charts are based on the 2020 cost and dollar value, accounting for inflation. This chart will be modified to make the entire bar values consistent with one another. That is, we will add an inflation factor on the current rate of the utility, making it consistent with the rate for different alternatives in the year 2020 dollar values (future value). Likewise, the future values could be converted to the current (2003) values for consistency and ease of comparison.

16. Put current cost in inflated value.

Please refer to question #15.

17. Consider showing cost as an index

Please refer to question #15.

18. Look at CAL-EPA Environmental Justice (EJ) principles which were just issued.

One of our objectives for the selection of the alternatives is to “Protect Quality of Life,” and the sub-objective to that is “Promote Environmental Justice.” A detailed analysis of environmental justice, as required by State and Federal laws, will be further addressed during the environmental documentation phase of the IRP.

19. Impacts on census tracts only consider new and adopted sewers and wastewater plants - not the stormwater facilities.

This is incorrect. For this initial alternatives screening, an “impact” was defined as a long-term impact that involved the physical presence of major facilities that include wastewater

treatment plants (new or expansions), wastewater collection systems and/or runoff treatment facilities.

20. How were original WW plants located? – Was it based on cheap land?

The original wastewater treatment plants were located close to the Los Angeles River or the ocean to allow for ease of treated effluent discharge, as well as to allow for gravity flow of almost the entire collection system, which minimizes pumping needs/costs and maximizes system reliability. Topography and proximity to a water body were the main factors in site selection.

21. Why is LR1 low with enhancing public land?

The Low Risk 1 (LR1) does not include neighborhood recharge options that would enhance vacant lots, parks, open spaces or abandoned alleys. Moreover, the dry weather options include runoff diversion to the existing treatment plants, with no increased capacity in the upstream plants. Therefore, this alternative produces less recycled water, and less public land allocated for such uses as wetlands and parks supplied by the recycled water.

22. Is cost inflation factored in? i.e. if CIP implemented in 8yrs?

Yes, please refer to question #15.

23. What inflation factors were assumed for cost?

4% capital, and 3% O&M.

24. Should we consider big outreach prior to developing preferred alternatives?

The EIR process, involves extensive outreach programs and public hearings to get feedback on selecting a preferred alternative. Neighborhood Councils and other stakeholders will also be briefed and asked to get more involved in this process. Also, please refer to the responses for questions 13 and 14 under the Green Group.

25. Hold community meetings with a non-technical tone. Explain to the public how the alternatives affect their communities. This should be conducted prior to EIR. You need to capture the “Big Picture.”

This is currently ongoing, through IRP presentations and briefings at Neighborhood Council meetings, meeting with the seven Neighborhood Council cabinet service areas, having an IRP information booth at the Neighborhood Congress whenever they meet, and through various City websites. We relay information to the public in a format sensitive to the needs of our audiences. For example, the Steering Group has demanded a more detailed and technical presentation of the material, therefore, we get into a lot of technical and detailed information. The Advisory groups and the Neighborhood Councils are addressed with more narrative descriptions of the facilities and the alternatives impacting their local neighborhoods. We will also give them the “big picture” and how the rest of the City is taking their share of the burdens and benefits.

26. Provide NCs meeting dates

The meeting dates will be provided to the stakeholders.

27. Low statistical variability concern with top 10 rankings

There is insignificant variability on the ranking of some of the alternatives, as shown on the chart. However, we will develop hybrid alternatives using the most desirable elements from the top ranking alternatives, based on feedback we received from the Steering Group. So far, what we have done is just the initial screening to determine the desirable attributes of the various alternatives.

28. Now better informed, can we redo the survey?

We will collect the survey from those stakeholders that have not turned in their surveys. The results, however, will not change the previous assumptions and the work that has been completed to date, unless significant changes are noted. Nevertheless, we will accumulate and use the information on the additional surveys received for incorporating into the hybrid alternatives that will eventually go through the EIR and a comprehensive stakeholder process. We will offer to sit down with any stakeholder who would like to review their survey result, and they can resubmit if they so desire.

29. What will be covered in WS9

The next Workshop (WS9) will cover new hybrid alternatives, feedback, and rankings of the developed hybrid alternatives.

30. Can we narrow cost down?

The financial planning will get a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the final selected alternatives for the upcoming EIR and stakeholder processes prior to submission for regulatory approval. At that time the breakdown of costs and the rate impacts will be addressed.

31. Show marginal cost.

Please refer to the previous question.

32. Who pays?

The percentage of rate increase will be the same for both commercial/industrial and residential users. Also, different funding strategies including the one that suggests that new developments pay for the marginal cost will be considered.

33. There is a concern on the survey feedback - Didn't accurately represent information/objectives – Can't say reached majority consensus if only 50% return of survey

The intent of the surveys were not to reach majority consensus but to determine the preferences of the steering group and establish what objectives were important to them, thereby combining the best elements from the top ranking preliminary alternatives to come up with a series of hybrid alternatives that incorporate as many of these “best elements”. Also, we only got 50% return of surveys, despite the fact that we had made a lot of efforts to have everyone review and complete the surveys (Please refer to responses for Questions 13 and 14 under the Green Group). However, for this initial screening process, we have to work with available data, keeping the pace of advancing the IRP.

34. Keep wastewater flow at current levels - growth issue - siting new plants- SCAG projection issue needs to be addressed.

The City is obligated by law to provide the water, wastewater, and runoff facility needs of the residents. There is a natural growth rate increase throughout the country, and the growth rate increase in the City of Los Angeles is comparable with that of the national average. City's Planning Department is involved with the IRP process and they implement the zoning and review SCAG projections.

35. One stakeholder claimed: I don't believe in your assumptions- that is why I refused to return the survey. The potable water is not safe.

The stakeholder that did not approve of the stakeholder driven IRP process was asked to have a one-on-one meeting with the staff to give specific and detailed suggestions that she could provide to replace our assumptions and procedures. She refused to meet with the IRP team to give specific and constructive inputs. Other stakeholders present validated the overall stakeholder approach of the IRP. The City's drinking water meets all existing drinking water standards. As supporting evidence, there have been no reports of documented mass outbreaks of waterborne disease from the City's water supply in the 90 years that the Los Angeles and other aqueducts have been supplying water to the City. Also, the national life expectancy has been increasing annually for over past 100 years, and Americans born today will live even longer lives. For more information please, refer to the LADWP.com website.