CITY OF LOS ANGELES
One Water LA
Stakeholder Workshop #2 (Phase 2)
Wednesday, June 29th, 2016 1:00 -3:30 pm

Meeting Notes

These notes are not intended to be a transcription of the One Water LA Phase 2 Workshop. These notes generally express the sentiment and information provided by those that attended.

Please refer to attachments for additional information regarding these notes.

INTRODUCTIONS:

Attendees were welcomed with opening remarks by Ali Poosti from Los Angeles Sanitation (LASAN) and Serge Haddad from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP). Ali Poosti briefly discussed the progress that has been made since the previous workshop (held December 2015) which included: 1) Development of five Special Topic Groups, 2) Continual interdepartmental/interagency collaboration that has led to the identification of potential case studies and 3) Long term integration alternatives along with Wastewater and Stormwater facilities Plans to support long term alternatives.

Serge Haddad provided the following LADWP updates: 1) On June 7, 2016, the Board of Water and Power approved the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, 2) City is meeting gallons per capita per day (gpcd) goals – currently at 104 gpcd, 3) Forty-three (43) million square feet of turf has been removed in the City and 4) LADWP is partnering with LASAN to pursue funding from Prop 1 for stormwater, recycled water and groundwater projects.

Lewis Michaelson (Katz & Associates) was the meeting facilitator and he reviewed the agenda, ground rules and meeting objectives. The workshop agenda was organized as follows:

1. Recycled Water Advisory Group (RWAG) Integration into One Water LA
2. Draft Ground Water Replenishment (GWR) Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
3. Ground Water Replenishment Pilot Study Phase 2
4. One Water LA Phase 2 Update
5. Partnerships, Collaboration and Innovation Report
6. Decentralized/Onsite Treatment Report
7. Next Steps

1. **RWAG Integration into One Water LA– Serge Haddad (LADWP)**

Please refer to One Water LA Workshop PowerPoint Presentation (Slides 7-13)

The presentation discussed the accomplishments of RWAG, some of which included finalizing Recycled Water Master Planning documents and a RWAG Consensus Statement. Additionally, the presentation explained the reason for RWAG integration into One Water LA which was to improve stakeholder coordination, consistent messaging and to allow stakeholders to provide input on both broader goals of One Water LA and the more specific topic of recycled water. It was also mentioned that LADWP will be conducting training sessions for Residential LADWP customers to pick up free recycled water (up to 300 gallons) from recycled water fill stations.

After the RWAG Integration into One Water LA presentation, stakeholders provided the following questions and comments summarized below:

Question: What is the maximum amount of recycled water you can collect?
Response: Up to 300 gallons of recycled water can be collected from the fill station per visit.

2. **Draft GWR Environmental Impact Report - Yoshiko Tsunehara (LADWP)**

Please refer to One Water LA Workshop PowerPoint Presentation (Slides 14-19)

The Draft GWR EIR presentation provided an update on the Los Angeles Groundwater Replenishment Project Draft Environmental Impact Report. The report was released for public review on May 12, 2016. The deadline to submit comments is July 11, 2016 (document available at www.ladwp.com/envnotices). The primary purpose of the EIR is to talk about construction impacts.

After the Draft GWR EIR presentation, stakeholders provided the following questions and comments summarized below:

Question: On one of the earlier maps there were injection wells shown on the pipes that lead to the Pacoima spreading grounds and they are not shown on the current map being presented.
Response: LADWP received comments during the scoping period that led to re-evaluating the location of the injections wells, as they were located close to the spreading grounds. This could impede spreading operations if the injection wells were operated during wet weather events as planned. There will be a future study on injection wells but they are not included in the current GWR project.

Question: There is concern about the preparation of the spreading grounds in regards to dust and pollution from diesel vehicles. Will there be any provisions for homeowners that may be impacted from an air quality standpoint?
Response: This comment refers to a separate project, the Pacoima Spreading Grounds Enhancement Project. It is unrelated to the GWR Project as GWR does not require upgrades to the existing spreading grounds, because the recycled water flow will be small compared to large

storms. Stakeholders are asked to contact LA County Flood Control District to voice concerns regarding spreading grounds projects.

Question: What happened during the two public meetings held? Was there any public pushback?
Response: Generally the project has been very well accepted at many community group meetings. One stakeholder voiced concerns in regards to using recycled water for drinking but their opinion was not held by the other attendees.

Comment: You mentioned Pacoima Spreading Grounds but no one has mentioned Sun Valley. At a meeting in Arleta, it was mentioned that the City plans to excavate 1.4 cubic yards of dirt and locate it all in Sun Valley.
Response: Stakeholders are asked to contact LA County Flood Control District to voice concerns regarding spreading grounds projects as they are independent of the GWR Project.

Question: There is one minor detail being forgotten which is numbers. If you look at the analysis of the recycled water, there is a negative rate of return over a 25 year payback. How do you still continue to go ahead with the project?
Response: City will continue to evaluate cost-benefits and conduct economic analysis on recycled water projects.

3. GWR Pilot Study Phase 2 – Bryan Trussell (Trussell Tech Inc.)

Please refer to Groundwater Replenishment Pilot Study Phase 2 PowerPoint Presentation

The GWR Pilot Study Phase 2 presentation provided an overview on the second phase of the pilot Advanced Water Treatment Facility that will meet the full scale treatment of the GWR project. Objectives of the pilot tests are to increase recovery of the product water, provide the most cost-effective solution while meeting regulatory requirements and public acceptance, accelerate the overall project schedule for the GWR project and plan for the future in regards to Direct Potable Reuse. Bryan Trussell briefly discussed the different treatment processes and Treatment Trains being tested during the Pilot Study. The Final Report for the Pilot Testing will be complete March 2017.

After the GWR Pilot Study Phase 2 presentation, stakeholders provided the following questions and comments summarized below:

Question: What is the footprint for the various treatment train options in terms of scaling up? How much acreage would be needed? There is a relatively limited area of the southeast corner of the Donald C. Tillman (DCT) Water Reclamation Plant.
Response: There are some preliminary layouts of the full Direct Potable Reuse Treatment Train and other treatment trains being considered. None of the treatment train options will be scaled up beyond the area available at DCT.

Question: Three years ago RWAG did a tour of a demonstration project at DCT. Why are we touring it again? Also could slides for future workshops be prepared and available to all attendees prior to the workshop date?

Response: The pilot study was conducted from February 2010 through June 2011.Since that time, the Title 22 regulations from the State Water Resources Control Board Division of Drinking Water were finalized (June 2014) and new studies and treatment technologies have emerged. The City wants to make sure public health is protected in the most cost-effective way possible. Slides for upcoming workshops will be prepared and available electronically to attendees prior to the workshop date.

Question: Is there a criteria besides cost for selection of the treatment train option strictly for the groundwater recharge portion? Is the City taking into consideration the removal of trace contaminants such as endocrine disruptors?
Response: The criteria are not based primarily on cost. Water recovery will be under consideration and regulations will also be under consideration to make sure the City is protecting public health. Schedule also plays a factor. A different treatment train means we may be able to spread recycled water sooner. Additionally, the City is analyzing the removal of trace contaminants that are not currently regulated and will consider their removal as part of treatment train selection criteria.

4. One Water LA Phase 2 Update – Lenise Marrero (LASAN), Tom West (Carollo Engineers, Inc)

Please refer to One Water LA Workshop PowerPoint Presentation (Slides 20-32)

During the One Water LA Phase 2 Update presentation, it was stated that there are multiple opportunities of involvement. These consist of the Steering Committee, Advisory Group, Focused Meetings, Stakeholder Workshops, Special Topic Groups, and Ad Hoc Technical Experts. To maximize near term opportunities for integration with City Departments and regional entities, the One Water LA team has identified potential case studies to: 1) evaluate operation and maintenance (O&M) requirements, 2) draft agreements among City Departments and Agencies for integrated projects, and 3) develop new policies to streamline processes for collaboration and O&M.

In regards to long-term integration opportunities, the City is looking at the Wastewater Facilities Plan while also considering stormwater and other needs. The City is looking at existing facilities to address: 1) existing and future conditions, 2) opportunities to leverage assets, and 3) fluctuations in flow projections.

After the One Water LA Phase 2 Update, stakeholders provided the following questions and comments summarized below:

Comment: None of the technical materials (e.g. list of projects, project cost, evaluation criteria, etc.) is being documented for the public online in any way. These are important policy discussions and the public needs access to them.
Response: No decisions have been made. In regards to the case studies, the cost of the project is not known. The purpose of the case studies is to evaluate what is needed to move the projects forward. Through the Special Topic Group on Funding, One Water LA is still evaluating the best process for cost-sharing. Stakeholders in the Funding Special Topic Group have

provided some ideas which will be shared at the next workshop. Stakeholder input is always welcome as the City evaluates funding criteria.

5. Partnerships, Collaboration and Innovation Report – Clint Granath (Forest Lawn)

Please refer to One Water LA Workshop PowerPoint Presentation (Slides 33-38)

The Partnerships, Collaboration and Innovation special topic group held three meetings to exchange ideas. These ideas included but were not limited to potable & non-potable reuse, process streamlining, mapping, water conservation, and climate change. At the last Special Topic Group meeting, the group identified priority recommendations and quick victories which were presented at the workshop.

During the discussion period, stakeholders provided the following questions and comments summarized below:

Question: For top priority recommendations under process streamlining, there is nothing on streamlining the process for small scale projects (e.g. curb cuts).
Response: The recommendation is saying that the process currently being implemented for large projects would also apply to small projects. Anyone who has a project can use the process to expedite permitting and implementation.

6. Decentralized/Onsite Treatment Report – Hampik Derkermenjian (CDM Smith), Dr. Tom Williams, Craig Kessler

Please refer to One Water LA Workshop PowerPoint Presentation (Slides 39-47)

The Decentralized/Onsite Treatment special topic group met three times. The first meeting focused on Onsite Treatment Systems, the second meeting focused on Graywater systems and the third meeting summarized all meeting discussions to develop conclusions and next steps. Based on interactive discussions from the meetings, draft guiding principles for the use of Onsite Treatment Systems and Graywater systems were developed by group members and presented at the workshop.

During the discussion period, stakeholders provided the following questions and comments summarized below:

Comment: What is the definition of graywater?
Response: The technical definition of graywater is untreated wastewater that has not been contaminated by toilet waste or unhealthy bodily waste. Graywater includes wastewater from bathtubs, showers, bathroom washbasins, clothes washing machines, and laundry tubs, but does not include wastewater from kitchen sinks or dishwashers. Graywater can only be used for subsurface irrigation.

Comment: It was mentioned that the water in the sewer system that is going to be reused has to come from the entity that originally produced it in order to use it. There are some pretty heavy implications in terms of new institutions that might choose not to connect to the wastewater system at all and instead install their own recycled water system and others that might want to disconnect from the wastewater system because in order to install their own recycled water system, they would have to pay fees and such things that they can avoid by just disconnecting their system.
Response: It is not possible for someone to completely disconnect from the sewer system since the sewer system always serves as a backup in case their recycled water system fails. Everyone needs to be connected to a sewer system if they are within 200 feet of a sewer line.

Comment: Provide the definitions for each of the different types of water so that people would have a better understanding.
Response: The One Water LA Team will post a glossary of terms on the website (www.OneWaterLa.org) that defines each of the different types of water.

Comment: In regards to graywater, all 96 Neighborhood Councils desperately need outreach opportunities. The City could do a homeowner and business stakeholder survey and do self-reporting. It is a starting point that could give the City a baseline on what we could expect to see in terms of quantifying the amount of water conserved by implementation of graywater systems.

Question: Has the City permitted a composting toilet?
Response: Yes the City has approved a number of composting toilets within the last six years.

Question: With this issue of institutions having to reuse their own wastewater what about in the case of a City department that wants to take water out of the sewer system to use for their own purpose?
Response: The City does not allow sewer mining (taking water from the sewer). Institutions can use their own onsite generated wastewater but they cannot take water out of the municipally owned sewer system.

Comment: Please encourage reusable water bottles instead of plastic bottles at future workshops.

7. Next Steps – Lewis Michaelson (Katz & Associates)

The next steps for the One Water LA Plan were presented. Next steps include:

1. Report Out on remaining three Special Topic Group Discussions
    a. Funding & Cost Benefit Analysis
    b. Outreach & Communication
    c. Stormwater & Urban Runoff Management
2. Pursue several Case Studies with Interdepartmental/Interagency collaboration

ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS

- Workshop Agenda
- One Water LA Workshop PowerPoint Presentation
- Groundwater Replenishment Pilot Study Phase 2 PowerPoint Presentation
- List of Attendees