One Water Los Angeles
Decentralized / Onsite Treatment
Special Topic Group – Meeting #1
2714 Media Center Drive, Los Angeles, 90065 (IWMD Conference Rooms)
Thursday, March 24th, 2016
2:00-4:00pm

"This summary reflects the opinions of stakeholders and may not necessarily be those of the City of Los Angeles."

Meeting Summary

The purpose of this summary is is to provide an overview of the discussion topics, including ideas, solutions and issues. It is not intended as a transcript or as minutes.

Meeting Attendees

Participants

Craig Kessler	Southern California Golf Association
Jim Stahl	MWH
Sarah Munger	MWH
Cris Sarabia	Greywater Action
Steven Johnson	Heal the Bay
Ruth Doxee	RWAG / LBNC
Margot Jacob	MLA
Robin Bentzin	UCLA
Katie Mika	UCLA
Guangyu Wang	SMBRC

Meeting Team

Facilitator	Hampik Dekermenjian	CDM
Technical Lead	Robin Nezhad	CDM
One Water LA Team	Lenise Marrero	LASAN
One Water LA Team	Denise Chow	LASAN
One Water LA Team	Flor Burrola	LASAN
One Water LA Team	Andre Goodrich	LASAN
One Water LA Team	Mario Acevedo	LADWP
One Water LA Team	Serge Haddad	LADWP
One Water LA Team	Bob Sun	LADWP
Note Taker	Leneyde Chavez	Carollo

Welcome & Introductions
The facilitator began the meeting with introductions of the One Water LA Team and the lead team. Self introductions of all participants followed.

Overview of the One Water LA Plan
An overview of the One Water LA Plan 2040 (One Water LA) was provided emphasizing the following:

- Attempting to find opportunities to collaborate.
- Mentioned the many topics that One Water LA will cover.
- Discussed the deliverables that the Plan will provide.
- Decentralized/Onsite Treatment is part of our special studies.
- Plan scheduled to be completed by January 2017. The EIR will be completed by 2018.

Other topics discussed include:

- Progress since the Water Integrated Resources Plan (IRP)
- IRP projected wastewater flows (increase) did not occur.
- Climate Change did not play a role in the IRP, but will be included into One Water LA plan.
- One Water LA aligns plans around the City - Integration with other City Dept. and Regional entities.
- One Water LA has already implemented a few quick fixes on City policies.

Road Map for the Outreach & Communications Special Topic Group
Background was provided regarding special topic groups (STGs). Public involvement approach is a significant part of this effort.
The purpose of the STGs is to gather input that will be considered during the development of One Water LA. Decentralized use is of particular importance to the City.

Objectives for group meetings:

- Meeting #1: Expected Outcome - Onsite Treatment
    - Gain input for the development of Guiding Principles
- Meeting #2: Expected Outcome – Graywater
    - Gain input for development of principles or approach for next steps
- Meeting #3: Expected Outcome – Summary of outcomes
    - Consolidate results from previous meetings

Background Presentation - Decentralized / Onsite Treatment
The technical lead provided background information and mentioned the following:

- Definition: Privately or City owned wastewater treatment plants that may discharge waste streams to the City systems and that are located near recycled water users.
- Examples discussed: Universities, local industry, golf courses, private developers, and the City.
- Discussed benefits and challenges
- Requested everyone's input to develop guiding principles that will help the City work with private and public entities wishing to treat their wastewater onsite.

Discussion and Engagement Opportunities
The facilitator opened the topic for discussion with the goal of developing a set of guidelines that will help the City. Some of the comments mentioned by participants are listed below. Please note that the comments below capture the general idea of stakeholder comments. Comments made by LADWP or LASAN staff are clearly identified.

- The group would like to see guidelines regarding public health.
- The City could require developers and facility managers to communicate with adjacent communities about onsite recycled water use.
- New developments should provide information regarding potential uses of water treated onsite. Since many efforts seem to be focused on outdoor irrigation, more public education is required to expand potential uses.
- Any non-potable use should have guidelines that would provide the user with information on how to use the effluent.
- Education campaign to ensure that onsite treated water is accepted by the public who might have concerns over water quality. This would help gain public support. A unified message is important.
- The City could require proper signage for landscape projects regarding onsite treated water.

Questions to consider: Who operates and monitors water quality of onsite treated water? Should anyone be allowed to do onsite treatment?

- Any developer should be able to propose an onsite treatment project but local agencies should act as a regulator and provide oversight to the process.
- Some things to consider through an application process:
    - Scope linked to displacing potable use / Offset of potable demand
    - Sign off on the engineering firm performing work
    - Containment systems and maintenance plan with public oversight

    - Over-ride plan in case of emergency
- Private systems should pay for taking away recycled water from City groundwater replenishment projects
- Onsite treatment should not be installed where purple pipe is accessible.
- Since onsite treatment can expand capacity, water should be made available to other users within an appropriate radius.
- LADWP stated that there are liability issues related to the previous suggestion – in reference to O&M and the safety of recycled water injected into the groundwater by private systems.
- LASAN should operate onsite treatment plants and LADWP should sell the water.
- LASAN indicated that there are no capacity issues at the City's treatment plants and that in fact, flows are low.
- LADWP stated that they will continue to promote conservation.
- Smaller onsite systems may find it difficult to transition into a future with direct potable reuse. All projects should consider how these smaller plants may become defunct in 20-30 years.
- Consider a fee related to the quality of effluent being disposed into the City's sewer system.
- Brine may increase the salinity of Recycled Water. High salinity water is not good for irrigation.
- Satellite systems should be part of the City's network. For smaller, on-site treatment facilities, cost needs to be considered. The development of goals for the industry which put a value on being environmentally sound is necessary.
- The City could require developers to address financial impact that these systems have on water quality and supply.

Questions to consider: How do you protect public health with multiple systems? Mitigation plan? Back-up plan if system fails?

- In order to sustain the economy and business life, the City should relax guidelines on public safety since these guidelines may be overly stringent.
- Social/environmental justice component to safety and water quality should be considered since affluent neighborhoods would be better able to keep up with funding necessary for onsite treatment.
- Examine risk vs. reward in terms of a water quality perspective.
- The groundwater basin is the best buffer to protect public health so long as plumes are not disturbed.
- There are concerns about cross connections: will need back flows on all meters and an agency charged with proper regulation and oversight. This effort might prove too cumbersome to the City. This will cause problems that local government may have to deal with in the future.

- Consider the possibility that eventually all water systems be integrated.

Follow-Up Action Items
Graywater will be discussed next time.
Next meeting will take place in three weeks.

Note: One last round of self-introductions took place in order to formally meet many stakeholders who arrived after the start of the meeting.