

Letter T2. Signatory – Westchester Transcript

DISCLAIMER

The transcripts of the City of Los Angeles' four public hearings -- held January 4 at Van Nuys City Hall, January 7 at the Council District 11 Field office in Westchester, January 11 at the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's office downtown, and January 12 at the Witherbee Auditorium -- are now available for viewing on the City's website: www.lacity-irp.org . The transcripts were prepared by certified court reporters and have been accepted by the City as reasonably accurate records of the public hearings. The City is not soliciting comments on the transcripts. The City is making the transcripts available through its website in the spirit of sharing information with those who have a common interest in the Integrated Resources Plan and its Draft Environmental Impact Report.

NEXT STEPS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS

The public comment period will close on March 31, 2006 and the City's environmental documentation team will begin the process of preparing the Final Environmental Impact Report. All comments -- written in letters and emails, or voiced at one of the four public hearings -- will be carefully reviewed and considered. The comments and responses to the comments will be published as a part of the Final EIR. The public will be notified as soon as the Final EIR is available.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
BUREAU OF SANITATION

INTEGRATED RESOURCES PLAN (IRP)
PUBLIC HEARING OF THE DRAFT EIR

HEARING OFFICER - JIM DOTY

Commencing : 11:00 A.M.
Location : 7166 West Manchester Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90045
Day, Date : Saturday, January 7, 2006
Reported by : TRULY A. VOSBERG, C.S.R. NO. 12656

Pages 1 - 23

JOB NO. 97564

APPEARANCES:

ALSO PRESENT:

JAWAHAR P. SHAH
ADEL H. HAGEKHALIL
NICK DEMOS
LOUIS UTSUMI
BILL VAN WAGONER
REBECCA BARRANTES
HEATHER VANMETER
JOE GEEVER
FRANCES SPIVY-WEBER
ROSSANA RAVELLI, SPANISH INTERPRETER

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc8-ac47b408eacb

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 2006

2 11:00 A.M.

3 -oOo-

4
5 MR. DOTY: Okay. I think we can get started now
6 if you would like to take a seat.

7 Good morning, and thank you for coming. My name
8 is Jim Doty; I'm an environmental supervisor for the city's
9 Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, and I'll be
10 the hearing officer today.

11 Thank you for attending. This is the second of
12 four public hearings for the Integrated Resources Plan
13 Environment Impact Report, otherwise known as IRP/EIR.

14 Simultaneous translation in Spanish is
15 available, so if you would like to hear these remarks in
16 Spanish, you can arrange it.

17 THE INTERPRETER: (Speaking in Spanish.)

18 MR. DOTY: Thank you. Gracias.

19 I hope you signed in on one of the sheets near
20 the door so we can keep you informed of future developments.
21 Also, I hope you picked up an agenda.

22 After this brief introduction there will be a
23 presentation of an overview of the IRP and the EIR. After
24 that, it will be your turn to speak and our job to listen.
25 Speaker cards are available in the back. If you would like

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 to speak, fill out a card and place it in the box or hand it
2 to an IRP team member.

3 IRP team members, would you please stand and
4 introduce yourselves. I'd like to start with Mr. Utsumi
5 here.

6 MR. UTSUMI: My name is Louis Utsumi, and I'm
7 involved in the Environmental Impact Report.

8 MR. DEMOS: My name is Nick Demos.

9 MS. VANMETER: Heather VanMeter.

10 MR. SHAH: Jawahar P. Shah.

11 MR. HAGEKHALIL: Adel Hagekhalil.

12 MR. VAN WAGONER: Bill Van Wagoner.

13 MS. BARRANTES: Rebecca Barrantes.

14 MR. DOTY: Thank you. Forms for submitting
15 written comments are also available on the back table. The
16 City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and the
17 Department of Water and Power have worked for quite a while
18 with leaders from many organizations and agencies in
19 developing alternatives setting priorities for the City's
20 Integrated Resources Plan. This has given us the opportunity
21 to interact closely with stakeholders at many informal public
22 meetings and workshops.

23 Today's public hearing is different; this is a
24 formal process. Everything said today is being recorded by
25 our court reporter and will be part of a formal record for

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408each

1 the preparation of the final Environmental Impact Report.

2 The public participation is essential to the
3 CEQA process. The purposes of review of the EIRs include:
4 Sharing expertise; disclosing agency analyses; checking for
5 accuracy; detecting omissions; discovering public concerns;
6 and soliciting counterproposals.

7 We hope you will focus on whether the EIR
8 sufficiently identifies and analyzes the IRP's possible
9 environmental impacts and ways in which the significant
10 effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated.
11 Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional
12 specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would
13 provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant
14 environmental effects.

15 At the same time keep in mind that the adequacy
16 of the EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably
17 feasible in light of factors such as the magnitude of the
18 project, the severity of its likely environmental impacts,
19 and the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not
20 require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all
21 research, study and experimentation recommended or demanded
22 by commenters.

23 Commenters should explain the basis for their
24 comments and should submit data or references offering facts,
25 reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinions

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 supported by facts. An effect will not be considered
2 significant in the absence of substantial evidence.
3 Reviewing organizations should include with their comments
4 the name of a contact person who would be available for later
5 consultation, if necessary.

6 This public hearing is your opportunity to tell
7 us what you think. Our job is to listen. Today we will
8 receive your oral comments on the draft EIR and move on to
9 the next speakers. We will not respond to your comments
10 today but will respond in writing in the final EIR. We
11 greatly appreciate the time and thought you are putting into
12 this effort.

13 And now I would like to introduce Louis Utsumi,
14 who will provide a technical overview.

15 MR. UTSUMI: Thank you. Hello. Thank you, Jim.

16 MR. DOTY: You got it on.

17 MR. UTSUMI: That's better. Thank you.

18 My name is Louis Utsumi, and as I mentioned
19 before, I was involved in the preparation of the
20 Environmental Impact Report. I'd like to provide a brief
21 overview of the alternatives as well as a summary of the
22 impacts that are discussed in the Environmental Impact
23 Report.

24 The Integrated Resources Plan is a facilities
25 planning process that's unique in that it is a

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 stakeholder-driven -- it utilizes a stakeholder-driven
2 alternative planning process. Various members of the
3 community were basically involved in a steering group that
4 played an integral role in the development of the
5 alternatives from the development of preliminary alternatives
6 to the screening and evaluation of those alternatives to the
7 selection of the alternatives that are carried in this
8 Environmental Impact Report.

9 The city is expected to grow over the next 20
10 years by an increase in population on the order of up to
11 800,000 persons, and this poses some substantial challenges
12 from a waste water management standpoint as well as from a
13 water provision standpoint. In addition, urban runoff is
14 increasingly becoming regulated, and all of the alternatives
15 that the state board has developed meet both the future needs
16 of the city as well as meet the regulatory requirements.

17 The IRP alternatives would involve or result in
18 long-term benefits, mainly cleaner rivers and oceans, cleaner
19 beaches, and that translates into improved public health and
20 safety. The alternative also increased the cycled water
21 usage and beneficially managed urban runoff, which would
22 result in increased sustainability over time.

23 The IRP alternatives are all very complex
24 alternatives and involve multiple components or elements.
25 Each alternative is comprised of a different mix of waste

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 water elements, recycled water and runoff elements. The
2 waste water elements are basically capacity increases at one
3 or more of the city's treatment plants and these sewers to
4 meet future needs and prevent overflow. And, again, with the
5 increase in population, there's a need to safely and
6 adequately manage waste water.

7 The recycled water elements would increase the
8 recycled water that's used to offset the need to import water
9 from outside of the city. We're looking right now about 85
10 percent of the city's water is imported from outside of the
11 city of Los Angeles. And then the runoff elements would
12 capture and beneficially reuse runoff to reduce pollution and
13 provide additional water resources.

14 A half-inch rainstorm within the city of L.A.
15 basically generates a little over two and a half billion
16 gallons of water, and the IRP alternatives would take a
17 portion of that and manage it.

18 The EIR includes five alternatives that are
19 analyzed. Four of the alternatives are build alternatives
20 that were developed by the Steering Group and the
21 stakeholders: Alternative 1, which is based on the expansion
22 of the Hyperion Treatment Plant; alternative 2 is based on
23 expansion of the Tillman Water Reclamation Plant and the Los
24 Angeles Glendale Water Reclamation Plant; and alternatives 3
25 and 4 are both based on the expansion of the Tillman Plant;

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408each

1 alternative 5 in the EIR is a no-project alternative, which
2 is required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

3 Okay. The features that are common to all of
4 the alternatives are some sort of capacity expansions at one
5 or more of the treatment plants. They all include three new
6 sewers; waste water storage at the Tillman Plant; increased
7 recycled water use; as well as dry weather and wet weather
8 runoff management features.

9 And of the waste water elements, again, I want
10 to just point out the three new sewers that extend from the
11 Eagle Rock area up to the Tillman Plant. It's this area in
12 yellow right here; this is the Eagle Rock area (indicating).

13 The first sewer is Northeast Interceptor Sewer,
14 Phase II, which extends from Eagle Rock to pass by Glendale,
15 L.A.-Glendale plant, up to the L.A. Zoo right about there
16 (indicating). The Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer, or
17 GBIS, extends from the Los Angeles Zoo area over to the
18 Toluca Lake area; and then the Valley Spring Lane Interceptor
19 Sewer, or VSLIS, extends from Toluca Lake over to the Tillman
20 Water Reclamation Plant.

21 What are the differences between the
22 alternatives? Alternative 1 focuses its capacity expansion
23 at the Hyperion Treatment Plant, which is the lowest point in
24 the waste water system. That's this plant right here
25 (indicating).

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408each

1 Alternative 1 also manages a moderate level of
2 recycled water on the order of up to 42,000 acre feet per
3 year. Excuse me, that was alternative 1.

4 Alternative 2 focuses the treatment capacity
5 expansions at the Tillman and L.A.-Glendale plant higher up
6 in the system in the Sepulveda flood control basin and
7 Northeast Los Angeles, and it manages a higher level or uses
8 a higher level of recycled water at approximately or up to
9 52,000 acre feet.

10 Alternative 3 and 4 focus the expansion at the
11 Tillman water reclamation plant, only with alternative 3
12 using a moderate level of recycled water -- 43,000 acre feet
13 per year -- and managing a lower level of runoff. The dry
14 weather runoff mentioned in alternative 3 is approximately
15 20, 26 percent of the dry weather runoff generated in the
16 city, whereas the rest of the alternatives, 1, 2, and 4,
17 manage 42 percent of the dry weather runoff, and then
18 alternative 3 manages 39 percent of the wet weather runoff in
19 the city, and the other alternatives manage 47.

20 Alternative 4, again, focuses its capacity at
21 Tillman, and it manages a higher level of recycled water at
22 56,000 acre feet per year.

23 That's a summary of the alternatives that are in
24 the EIR. There's a lot more details contained in section 2
25 of the EIR, and you'll be able to get a much more thorough

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 understanding of the alternatives.

2 Okay. Moving on to the Environmental Impact
3 Report. The California Environmental Quality Act is the
4 governing law which the city must comply with. And this law
5 requires that decisionmakers and in this case, it's the city
6 council -- consider the environmental consequences of a
7 project before they approve that project.

8 CEQA also requires that if a project has a
9 potential to result in significant impact, that Environmental
10 Impact Reports be prepared. So for the Integrated Resources
11 Plan we have prepared an Environmental Impact Report. And
12 that report identifies the environmental impacts that the
13 city council will consider in their decisionmaking process.

14 These are the environmental issue areas that are
15 included in the EIR: Ranges from aesthetics; air quality;
16 geology; noise; recreation; and cumulative impacts. And all
17 of these resource areas are discussed in the EIR in
18 Section 3.

19 The EIR identifies several significant impacts
20 after the incorporation of mitigation measures. From an air
21 quality standpoint, there will be significant instruction in
22 operational impacts related to emissions that are generated
23 during the construction and operation of phases. And they're
24 significant because they exceed the Air Quality Management
25 District's significant thresholds. The IRP alternatives will

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 also result or have the potential to result in potential odor
2 impacts at the Hyperion treatment plant as well as at the air
3 treatment facilities for the NEIS, GBIS and VSLIS sewers.

4 Cultural resources: The EIR identifies impacts
5 related to the potential damage to archeology or paleontology
6 resources. These are varied resources, and unless
7 instructed, if they are encountered during construction, they
8 could be damaged, and that's considered to be significant.

9 There's a potential for significant geology and
10 soils related impacts. Southern California has numerous
11 faults in the area, and one of the faults is the
12 Hollywood-Raymond fault in the northeast Los Angeles area.
13 The NEIS sewer is going to cross that fault. And although
14 engineering mitigation will be incorporated into the sewer,
15 there still is a potential if a substantial earthquake occurs
16 for NEIS II to be damaged. And that's considered to be a
17 significant impact.

18 There's always potential for new sewers to cause
19 surface settlement during construction as the tunnelling
20 machine progresses underground. From a recreational
21 standpoint, there is a potential to affect recreational
22 facilities both from construction sites for the new sewers
23 that are placed at the recreational facilities, as well as
24 permanent facilities such as air treatment facilities placed
25 at recreational resources. Because those, both construction

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 and permanent facilities, could reduce the level of area
2 that's from the recreational areas, that's considered to be a
3 significant impact.

4 Okay. There's a significant impact related to a
5 potential shaft site at the Los Angeles Zoo parking lot for
6 both the NEIS II and the GBIS sewers. It's an optional shot
7 site, and if that shaft site is used, it would result in a
8 loss of up to 225 parking spaces at the zoo, which is
9 considered to be significant.

10 And lastly from a water quality standpoint,
11 because Southern California is prone to earthquakes and
12 earthquakes are unpredictable, there is a remote possibility
13 that a new sewer could suffer a break. And if that occurs,
14 waste water within the sewers could get into the ground
15 water. That's considered to be a significant impact.

16 Section 3, again, of the EIR has a far more
17 detailed discussion of these impacts as well as the impacts
18 of the other resource areas.

19 Next steps, two additional public hearings are
20 going to be held, one in downtown Los Angeles, this
21 Wednesday, January 11th, at the Department of Water and Power
22 Auditorium, and the next at the Los Angeles Zoo in the
23 Witherbee Auditorium on Thursday, January 12th. Comments on
24 the draft EIR are due on February 27th, close of business.
25 And all of the comments that are received will be responded

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408each

1 to within the final EIR, which is expected in spring of 2006.
2 And then staff, city staff will make a recommendation for
3 final certification -- certification of the final EIR and
4 project approval for one of the IRP alternatives, and that's
5 expected to occur in summer of 2006.

6 Okay. And then again, comments are due on the
7 EIR February 27th. And you can send them in writing to
8 Jawahar Shah at the above address, or you can send them by
9 e-mail at the address at the bottom of the slide.

10 Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. DOTY: Okay. Thank you, Louis.

12 Now it is your turn to speak, and our time to
13 listen. First, a few ground rules. We will go through the
14 speaker cards. If you have not submitted a card, you may do
15 so at any time prior to the close of the hearing. When you
16 are called upon to speak, please begin by stating your name,
17 and I think our court reporter would appreciate it if you
18 would spell your last name. And if you are representing an
19 agency or group, please tell us the name of the group.
20 Please speak clearly so that your concerns can be recorded
21 accurately, and please limit your comments to around three
22 minutes.

23 Speakers can return, time permitting, after all
24 of the other speakers have been accommodated. If you are a
25 first-timer here at this facility, I'll just point out that

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 rest rooms and a drinking fountain are available through this
2 door to my left. If you are headed to a rest room, you will
3 need a key, which is hanging on the coat rack. The women's
4 room key has lost its tag, but it is hanging there without a
5 tag.

6 Okay. Joe Geever. Would you like to come up?
7 We've provided a chair here that you can come up and speak.

8 MR. GEEVER: My name is Joe Geever,
9 G-e-e-v-like-Victor-e-r, and I'm the Southern California
10 regional manager for the SurfRider Foundation. SurfRider is
11 an environmental organization of over 50,000 members, all
12 dedicated to the restoration and protection of our coast and
13 ocean.

14 First, I want to thank you guys for holding
15 these hearings. This is a massive plan and deserves the
16 heightened outreach and public input you're allowing here
17 today.

18 On a general note, we want to support the goals
19 of this IRP. The idea of treating water as a life sustaining
20 resource rather than a nuisance is long since overdue. Your
21 recognition of the intersection between managing flood
22 control to addressing water pollution problems and supplying
23 the region with sustainable water supplies is commendable.
24 We want to point out that given the right choices, this IRP
25 can also meet the tangential goals of restoring coastal

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408each

1 habitat and providing public benefits of expanded
2 recreational and educational opportunities.

3 Excuse me.

4 Orange County's treatment wetland system of
5 watershed-wide network of constructed wetlands is a great
6 model for this concept and is gaining national recognition as
7 a truly integrated management approach, not to mention
8 federal, state and local funding support.

9 While this draft EIR appears to recognize these
10 important benefits in some regards, we hope decisionmakers
11 will give this some heightened attention.

12 I only have a couple specific comments that we
13 hope to better flush out in the coming weeks.

14 First is that we're always concerned when
15 agencies intermingle project specific analysis into a
16 programmatic EIR. Mixing these two processes complicates
17 public participation at best, and at worse it precludes an
18 open analysis of alternatives at the program level.

19 As I said, we'll be reviewing the draft more
20 thoroughly, but we just wanted to bring this general concern
21 to your attention. We hope that the project's specific
22 components of this EIR are thorough and that there is no
23 disagreement that these components are critical parts of
24 achieving the program goals.

25 We have a more specific concern that is

Response to Comment T2-1

Comment noted. It should be noted that under Section 15168 (c) (5) of the CEQA Guidelines, a Program EIR is the appropriate environmental document for an agency program or series of actions that can be characterized as one large project. As described in response to comment AJ1-26, throughout the development of the IRP Facilities Plan and the IRP EIR, the City has made concerted efforts to involve key stakeholders and concerned public in the process. The commenter is also referred to responses to comments AJ1-1, AJ13-1, and O28-1 (public comment period); O6-1 (public hearings); and O22-4 (public outreach), which address the commenter's concerns regarding the public participation process associated with the IRP Draft EIR. Additionally, as discussed in response to comment AJ1-26, the Draft EIR evaluates all four Project Alternatives, which include both program- and project-level components, at a co-equal level to facilitate full consideration and disclosure of impact. The consideration of the four alternatives at a coequal level of analysis facilitates full disclosure of impacts and adheres to the City's objectives of obtaining robust public comments to aid in the identification of the alternative that best meets engineering design needs and addresses public concerns.

Response to Comment T2-2

The Draft EIR adequately analyzed the project-level components and the four Project Alternatives. Program-level components were qualitatively analyzed and will undergo future environmental review once the project-level component design is developed (Sections 1.2.2 and 3.1.2 of the Draft EIR).

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408each

1 appropriate for this meeting because it has to do with a
2 proposal for a treatment wetland in the lower Ballona
3 watershed. Your draft indicates that you've received
4 recommendations to consider treatment wetlands in area D of
5 the Ballona wetlands.

6 Oddly, the language in the EIR seems to indicate
7 that this is a potentially feasible consideration and could
8 help meet the requirements of the existing Ballona watershed
9 TMDLs, but then goes on to postpone further consideration of
10 this component.

11 I'll add here that we're actually in the process
12 of trying to get a feasibility study done on that proposal,
13 and we'd be glad to forward that feasibility study to you if
14 we are successful in getting funded and getting that project
15 completed.

16 So this possibly highlights our concern about
17 combining projects specific final analysis with programmatic
18 EIRs. Arguably, the inclusion of this specific project and
19 others like it will have an impact on the need for diversions
20 of polluted runoff to the treatment infrastructure and,
21 consequently, the degree to which those facilities will need
22 improvements and expansion.

23 In other words, we're concerned about approving
24 project components of the EIR before the programmatic EIR has
25 been fully vetted. Like I said earlier, we still need to

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 examine the draft more thoroughly before drawing any
2 conclusions.

3 Once again, thank you for holding these meetings
4 and coming out to visit us in the coastal communities that
5 are arguably most impacted by this program. We look forward
6 to communicating with you more in the future.

7 If I got a second, maybe I'll add a couple other
8 things that we're working on.

9 MR. DOTY: I think we have time.

10 MR. GEEVER: We are working on a new program
11 we're calling Ocean Friendly Gardens, which is our effort to
12 bring public attention and public support to water
13 conservation through irrigation and landscaping practices.
14 We'd love to share that concept with you and see how we can
15 integrate that into your water conservation plans.

16 And our idea of focusing some public attention
17 on that and waste water reclamation and other programs that
18 you have in this EIR is making the link between these efforts
19 and ocean water quality something that we don't think the
20 public fully gets and taking the public's concern for ocean
21 water quality and putting it into programs that can improve
22 that and simultaneously save water.

23 So I'd love to answer any questions, talk to you
24 more about the treatment wetlands down in Ballona or anything
25 else I might have said that raises some interest with you.

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 Thanks again.

2 MR. DOTY: Thank you Mr. Geever.

3 Next is Frances Spivy-Weber.

4 MS. SPIVY-WEBER: I'm Frances Spivy,

5 S-p-i-v-as-in-Victor-y, hyphen, Weber, with one B. I

6 represent the Mono Lake Committee, and I, too, am pleased to

7 be here.

8 I have three main points to make. One is to
9 thank you for having done Phase I prior to Phase II because
10 it has, I think, made this Phase II presentation of -- of
11 programs and projects much stronger. I don't think we would
12 have had near the storm water -- integration of storm water
13 and dry winter runoff without Phase I. So thank you.

14 Secondly, I want to urge you to consider not
15 just one alternative, but to look at the comments that are
16 made on the various elements of the various alternatives so
17T2-3 that at the end of the day when you're making a presentation
18 to the city council, you're presenting the best of the best,
19 which may mean taking from alternative 2 and alternative 4
20 and so on.

21 Finally, I think when -- I'm aiming these
22 comments, although I'm going to have more detailed comments
23 in the future -- when you're making the presentation to the
24 city council, I hope that you present more than is required
25 in an EIR.

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408each

Response to Comment T2-3

Because each Project Alternative is a system-wide integrated alternative developed with stakeholder input, they represent different combinations of facilities and strategies to meet the IRP objectives. The Project Alternatives emphasize different approaches to meet the objectives such as emphasizing wastewater treatment capacity upstream in the system versus downstream in the system. It should be noted that the City will use a trigger-flow concept to identify when facilities would be improved, and that if conditions change in the future, additional options for addressing the conditions would be considered at that time. Comment noted.

Response to Comment T2-4

T2-4

1 For example, the projects that are being
 2 proposed could and should have very significant impacts on
 3 increase in water supply -- in local supplies of water, which
 4 will have cost dividends to the Department of Water and
 5 Power. You would be getting with conservation, in particular
 6 lower cost water with recycled water, and -- and infiltration
 7 of storm water and reuse of storm water. You could get both
 8 lower cost water as well as more reliable water, avoiding
 9 some of the risks associated with imported water.

10 Another place to look for -- or another place to
 11 add emphasis to your presentation to the city council is to
 12 look at the jobs enhancement impact of these projects. Not
 13 only the -- the construction, which certainly there will be
 14 some jobs associated with that -- but the both short-term and
 15 long-term maintenance of landscape, which is a major
 16 component of your addressing dry weather runoff. These jobs
 17 are often available to low income community organizations as
 18 well as non -- as well as for-profit companies, and there is
 19 a tremendous opportunity to enhance this whole section of job
 20 opportunities in Los Angeles.

21 And not just with replacing sprinklers which was
 22 in the summary I read, but there are a number of landscape
 23 opportunities both in replacing turf in hard-to-water areas
 24 with -- with artificial turf or other mechanisms where you
 25 aren't using turf. Also, there are low water use brooms that

Comment noted. The IRP presents four Project Alternatives to meet the future wastewater system needs of the City of Los Angeles in the year 2020, while integrating recycled water and runoff systems. The benefit of water conservation, reuse and replenishment is inherent in many of the goals and objectives of the IRP (Section 1.3 of Draft EIR). The potential benefits of these water management components (identified as potential ranges in the reduction of potable water usage in various portions of Section 2 of the Draft EIR) will be used as a factor in determining the Recommended Alternative (refer to Section 1.5 of this Final EIR). As for the project construction enhancing jobs, comment noted. Although the IRP components were based on an extensive facilities plan/process, the components carried through as components analyzed in the Draft EIR do not limit or hinder the City from pursuing other alternatives or methods of water conservation or management. Regarding potential sources of funding, as triggers (i.e., demand or regulatory drivers) result in the need to implement the components of the project as certified, then sources of funding can be reviewed and pursued as appropriate.

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408each

1 recycle water rather than using hoses for taking care of --
2 of dry weather cleanup. So there -- again, there are a
3 number of alternatives beyond which were mentioned in the
4 summary. I will look in the main sections. There may be
5 more there. But all of these could be job creating, and I'm
6 assuming that there are other job creating activities,
7 drawing on what Joe Geever just said, in enhancing the
8 recreational opportunities of a cleaner ocean and beach area.

9 Finally, I think that funding opportunities, if
10 we are working within the region, not just within the city,
11 will be greater. That's why I am particularly interested in
12 the expansion of the Glendale -- the L.A.-Glendale plant and
13 the enhancement of that plant to be able to do RO. The
14 limited state and federal funds are increasingly being
15 targeted for integrated resources planning at the regional
16 level, not just at the city level.

17 So I urge you to consider looking at the funding
18 possibilities and whether those would be enhanced by certain
19 choices, like the Glendale project over other choices. And
20 as I say, I will have more comments for the future, but those
21 are some of my initial thoughts.

22 MR. DOTY: Very good. Thank you.

23 That was the last speaker card I have before me.

24 Is there anybody who would like to speak?

25 Okay. I see no one rushing to the microphone.

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408eacb

1 So that concludes the public comment portion of the hearing.

2 Thanks again to everyone for coming.

3 The public comment period will remain open until
4 5:00 P.M. on Monday, February 27th, and until then you may
5 submit written comments to the address on the overhead slide
6 or on-line or via e-mail.

7 Please remember to include the following
8 information: Your full name; complete address, including zip
9 code; telephone number, including area code; and the name of
10 the organization, if you are representing an organization.

11 This is the second of four public hearings. You
12 do not have to attend the next two, but you are invited to do
13 so and encourage others to do so, too. The location of the
14 other public hearings are given in the Notice of
15 Availability, copies of which are available to the rear of
16 the room.

17 Thank you very much for coming. This hearing is
18 now closed.

19

20 (The hearing proceedings
21 were concluded at 11:32 A.M.)

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc9-ac47b408each

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFIED COPY CERTIFICATE

I, TRULY A. VOSBERG, Certified Shorthand Reporter, No. 12656, do hereby certify that the attached transcript is a correct and certified copy of the proceedings taken before me on January 7, 2006, as thereon stated.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Covina, California, this 14th day of February, 2006.

TRULY A. VOSBERG
C.S.R. NO. 12656

a375e855-3442-409d-bdc8-ac47b408eacb

Letter T3. Signatory – Downtown LA Transcript

DISCLAIMER

The transcripts of the City of Los Angeles' four public hearings -- held January 4 at Van Nuys City Hall, January 7 at the Council District 11 Field office in Westchester, January 11 at the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's office downtown, and January 12 at the Witherbee Auditorium -- are now available for viewing on the City's website: www.lacity-irp.org . The transcripts were prepared by certified court reporters and have been accepted by the City as reasonably accurate records of the public hearings. The City is not soliciting comments on the transcripts. The City is making the transcripts available through its website in the spirit of sharing information with those who have a common interest in the Integrated Resources Plan and its Draft Environmental Impact Report.

NEXT STEPS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS

The public comment period will close on March 31, 2006 and the City's environmental documentation team will begin the process of preparing the Final Environmental Impact Report. All comments -- written in letters and emails, or voiced at one of the four public hearings -- will be carefully reviewed and considered. The comments and responses to the comments will be published as a part of the Final EIR. The public will be notified as soon as the Final EIR is available.

INTEGRATED RESOURCES PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT REVIEW

PUBLIC HEARING NO. 3

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2006

DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER
JOHN FERRARO BUILDING
111 NORTH HOPE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Reported by: KATRIN ECKERT, C.S.R. NO. 12696

Pages 1 - 26

Job No. 97565

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2006

2 10:15 A.M.

3 -000-

4
5 MR. DOTY: My name is Jim Doty. I am an
6 Environmental Supervisor for the Department of Public
7 Works' Bureau of Engineering, and I will serve as the
8 hearing officer this morning.

9 Thank you all for attending today. This is the
10 third of four public hearings for the Integrated
11 Resources Plan and Environmental Impact Report,
12 effectively known as IRP EIR.

13 Simultaneous translation in Spanish is
14 available for those of you that need it or would just
15 like to hear the proceedings in Spanish.

16 Will the translator please translate.

17 (Spanish translation.)

18 MR. DOTY: I hope you signed in on one of the
19 sheets up front when you came in so that we can keep you
20 informed of future developments. Also, I hope you picked
21 up an agenda.

22 And after this brief introduction, there will
23 be a presentation of an overview of the IRP and the EIR.
24 After that it will be your turn to speak and our job to
25 listen. Speaker cards are available. Here is a sample

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

Page 3

1 (indicating). If you think you would like to speak, fill
2 out a card and place it in the box on the table up front
3 or hand it to any IRP Team member.

4 IRP Team members, will you please introduce
5 yourselves, and this time around name and job. Let's
6 start over here with Nick Dimas.

7 MR. DIMAS: Hi. My name is Nick Dimas. I'm
8 with the Bureau of Engineering, and I'm the project
9 manager for part of the STET.

10 MS. BOYLE VAN METER: I'm Heather Boyle
11 VanMeter. I'm the project manager for the IRP.

12 MR. ERB: I'm Tom Erb, the director of Water
13 Resources with the LA Department of Water and Power.

14 MR. VAN WAGONER: I'm Bill Van Wagoner, DWP
15 Water Recycling.

16 MS. CRUZ: Patricia Cruz, with the Bureau of
17 Sanitation, IRP Team member.

18 MR. SHAH: And I'm Janahak Shah. I'm the
19 assistant project manager for the IRP.

20 MR. UTSUMI: I'm Louis Utsumi. I'm with the
21 IRP Team that worked on the Environmental Impact Report.

22 MR. DOTY: Thank you.

23 Forms for submitting written comments as
24 opposed to verbal comments are also available out on the
25 table at the front door, if you wish to do that.

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 The City of Los Angeles' Department of Public
2 Works and Department of Water and Power have worked for
3 quite a while with leaders from many organizations and
4 agencies in developing alternatives and setting
5 priorities for the City's INTEGRATED RESOURCES PLAN.
6 This has given us the opportunity to interact closely
7 with stakeholders and -- at many informal hearings and
8 workshops.

9 Today's public hearing is different. This is a
10 formal process. Everything said today is being recorded
11 by our court reporter who is seated down in front here
12 (indicating), and will be part of a formal record for the
13 preparation of the final environmental impact document.

14 Public participation is an essential part of
15 the CEQA process. The purposes of reviewing the EIRs
16 include: Sharing expertise, disclosing agency analyses,
17 checking for accuracy, detecting omissions, discovering
18 public concerns, and soliciting counter proposals.

19 We hope you will focus on whether the EIR
20 sufficiently identifies and analyzes the IRP's possible
21 environmental impacts and ways in which the significant
22 effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated.

23 Comments are most helpful when they suggest
24 additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures
25 that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the

1 significant environmental effects.

2 At the same time, keep in mind that the
3 accuracy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is
4 reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the
5 magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its
6 likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of
7 the project.

8 CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct
9 every test or perform all research, study, and
10 experimentation recommended or demanded by the
11 commenters.

12 Commenters should explain the basis for their
13 comments and should submit data or references offering
14 facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert
15 opinion supported by facts. An effect will not be
16 considered significant in the absence of substantial
17 evidence. Reviewing organizations should include their
18 comments -- excuse me -- include in their comments the
19 name of a contact person who would be available for later
20 consultation if necessary.

21 This public hearing is your opportunity to tell
22 us what you think. Our job is to listen. We will
23 receive your oral comments on the Draft EIR and move on
24 to the text speakers. We will not respond to your
25 comments today, but we will respond in writing in the

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 final EIR. We greatly appreciate the time and thought
2 you are putting into this effort.

3 And now I would like to introduce Louis Utsumi
4 who will provide a technical overview of the IRP and EIR.

5 MR. UTSUMI: Okay. Thank you, Jim.

6 Again, my name is Louis Utsumi, and I worked on
7 the Environmental Impact Report as part of the EIR Team.

8 What I would like to do today is provide a
9 brief summary or overview of the alternatives that are
10 included in the Environmental Impact Report, and then
11 highlight some of the key environmental impacts that are
12 identified in the EIR.

13 The IRP is a unique process, in that it is a
14 facilities plan that utilized stake -- utilizes a
15 stakeholders-driven alternatives planning process. The
16 previous facilities plan did not use an
17 alternatives-driven planning process. Various members of
18 the community and stakeholders comprised a steering group
19 that actively developed, evaluated and screened the IRP
20 alternatives that are included in the EIR.

21 Some of the considerations during the
22 development of the EIR conclude the future needs and
23 regulatory requirements of the City.

24 The City's population is expected to increase
25 by up to 800,000 over the next 20 years or so, and this

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 poses waste water management and water provision
2 challenges. Also, our urban runoff quality is becoming
3 increasingly regulated. So all of the alternatives that
4 were developed by the stakeholders meet future needs and
5 regulatory requirements.

6 There are some benefits with the IRP
7 alternatives, namely cleaner -- cleaner rivers, oceans
8 and beaches, and that translates into improved public
9 health and safety. The IRP alternatives will also
10 increase the amount of recycled water that will be used
11 as long as we beneficially reuse urban runoff, and that
12 helps increase sustainability.

13 Okay. All of the IRP alternatives are fairly
14 complex alternatives that are comprised of a different
15 mix of various elements: Waste water, recycled water and
16 urban runoff elements.

17 The waste water elements include capacity
18 expansions at one or more of our treatment plans and new
19 large-diameter interceptor sewers to meet future need to
20 prevent overflow. And again, with the increase in
21 population planned or projected for the City, there is a
22 need to adequately and safely manage the waste water
23 that's generated.

24 The recycled water elements will all increase
25 the amount of recycled water that's used in order to

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 offset the need to import water. And currently the City
2 of Los Angeles imports about 85 percent of its water from
3 outside of the city area.

4 And lastly, the runoff elements will all
5 capture and beneficially reuse runoffs to reduce
6 pollution as well as provide additional water resources.
7 A typical half-inch storm in Los Angeles over the City
8 generates over two and a half million gallons of water,
9 and the IRP alternatives would manage a portion of that
10 water and beneficially reuse a portion of that water.

11 Okay. There are five alternatives that are
12 included in the EIR and outlined in equal detail in the
13 EIR. Four of the alternatives are build alternatives
14 that were developed by the IRP stakeholders.

15 Alternative 1 is based on capacity expansion at
16 the Hyperion Treatment Plant.

17 Alternative 2 is based on treatment expansion
18 at both the Tillman Water Reclamation Plant and the
19 L.A./Glendale Water Reclamation Plant.

20 And then Alternatives 3 and 4 would provide for
21 capacity expansion at the Tillman Plant.

22 And then Alternative 5 of the Environmental
23 Impact Report is the "no project alternative" which is
24 required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

25 There are numerous features that are common to

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 all the alternatives: They all involve capacity
2 expansion at one or more of the treatment plants. They
3 all involve treating sewers. They all propose storage,
4 resources storage at the Tillman Water Reclamation Plant.
5 They all utilize different levels of increased recycled
6 water as well as dry-weather and wet-weather runoff
7 management features.

8 From a waste water standpoint, the -- all of
9 the alternatives include three new sewers between
10 Eaglerock and Tillman, which is highlighted in yellow on
11 the screen. Right here (indicating).

12 The Northeast Interceptor Sewer Phase 2 extends
13 from Eaglerock over to the L.A. Zoo area, which is right
14 there on Spring (indicating). This is the Eaglerock area
15 past the water reclamation plant, the L.A. Zoo area
16 (indicating).

17 The second sewer is the Glendale/Burbank
18 Interceptor Sewer, or GBIS, and that extends from the
19 L.A. Zoo area to possibly the Toluca Lake area, right
20 there (indicating). And then the last sewer is the
21 Valley Spring Lake Interceptor Sewer, or VSLIS, and that
22 extends from Toluca Lake to the Tillman Water Reclamation
23 Plant in this area (indicating).

24 And we have just focused our attention to these
25 sewers because many of the impacts in the EIR are related

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 to these sewers.

2 Okay. What are some of the differences between
3 the EIR alternatives? Alternative 1 focuses on its
4 treatment capacity of Hyperion and would expand the
5 Hyperion Plant from 450 million gallons per day to 500
6 million gallons per day. The treatment plant is located
7 in the Dockweiler Beach area at the low point of the
8 waste water system. This alternative would also manage
9 or use a moderate level of recycled water with up to
10 42,000 acre feet per year.

11 Alternative 2 would instead focus its capacity
12 expansion at the Tillman and L.A./Glendale Plants higher
13 up in the system. Sepulveda Basin is where Tillman is
14 located, and Northeast Los Angeles is where the
15 L.A./Glendale Plant is located. Alternative 2 gives us a
16 high level of recycled water with up to 53,000 acre feet.

17 Alternative 3 focuses its treatment expansion
18 at Tillman, Tillman only, and uses a moderate level of
19 recycled water. I believe it's 43,000 acre feet per
20 year. This also is managed on a lower level of urban
21 runoff than Alternatives 1, 2 or 4. Alternative 3
22 manages 26 percent of the dry-weather runoff, whereas the
23 other alternatives manage 42 percent; and Alternative 3
24 also manages 39 percent of the wet-weather urban runoff,
25 whereas the other alternatives manage 47 percent.

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 And then lastly, Alternative 4 focuses its
2 expansion at Tillman, and it uses a high level of
3 recycled water with up to 56,000 acre feet per year.

4 Okay. That's a quick summary of the IRP
5 alternatives in the EIR. Section 2 of the Environmental
6 Impact Report has a much greater level of detail than
7 what I just provided to you. You can find additional
8 information in Section 2.

9 I want to focus a little bit on the
10 Environmental Impact Report and then on the -- on the
11 impacts that we have identified.

12 The California Environmental Quality Act, or
13 CEQA, is the governing law which the City must comply
14 with, and this law requires that decision-makers consider
15 the consequences, environmental consequences of a project
16 before they actually approve that project. The law also
17 requires that if a project has the potential to result in
18 significant environmental impact, then an Environmental
19 Impact Report must be prepared.

20 And we have prepared a Draft EIR, Environmental
21 Impact Report, for the IRP because of the potential for
22 it to cause significant impacts. The impacts that are
23 identified in the EIR are the impacts that the City
24 Council or the decision-makers will consider before we
25 approve an IRP project.

1 Okay. This next slide highlights some of the
2 environmental resource areas that are included and
3 analyzed in the EIR. There is a whole range of resource
4 areas from esthetics and air quality to noise, population
5 housing, and cumulative impacts.

6 The EIR identified various significant impacts
7 after mitigation has been incorporated or identified.
8 The first is air quality. There is a possibility of
9 significant air quality impact during both construction
10 and operation of the IRP alternatives, and that's because
11 those phases, the construction and operational phases,
12 would generate emissions that would exceed the
13 significant threshold established by the Air Quality
14 Management District.

15 There is also a potential for significant odors
16 related to activities and operations at the Hyperion
17 Treatment Plant, as well as at air treatment facilities
18 that are proposed for the new sewers, namely GBIS and
19 VSLIS. Air treatment facilities draw air from the sewer
20 system and then treat it through a two-stage process
21 before releasing the treated air into the atmosphere.
22 But because of the compounds involved, there is
23 detectable at very low levels. There is a possibility
24 that odors could occur in close proximity to the air
25 treatment facilities. So that's a significant impact.

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 Regarding cultural resources, there is a
2 possibility that buried archeological and paleontological
3 resources could be encountered and damaged during
4 construction. And because of that, that's considered to
5 be significant.

6 Regarding geology and soils, Southern
7 California is prone to earthquakes due to the many faults
8 that underline the area. There is one fault in
9 particular, the Hollywood Raymond Fault, which crosses
10 through Northeast Los Angeles, and the Northeast
11 Interceptor Sewer Phase 2 will actually cross the
12 Hollywood Raymond Fault.

13 And although mitigation has been incorporated
14 to minimize the potential for breakage, earthquakes are
15 unpredictable, and the City cannot discount completely
16 that these sewers would not be ruptured during an
17 earthquake along that fault. Because of that, that's
18 considered to be a significant impact.

19 The EIR also identifies a potential for
20 settlement during construction, in that the tunneling
21 machine advances underground, and there could be some
22 sort of surface settlement that occurs, which is also
23 considered significant.

24 Recreation. Various construction shaft sites
25 as well as permanent facilities, and these are the air

1 treatment facilities, are proposed for various
2 recreational areas, and they would result in a reduced
3 amount of area of the recreational resources; and that's
4 considered to be significant.

5 The remaining two significant impacts that are
6 identified are related to parking and to water quality.
7 One of the shaft sites for both NEIS 2 and GBIS as an
8 optional shaft site is the Los Angeles Zoo parking lot.
9 And on that shaft site, there is storage that can be
10 allotted to up to 225 spaces, parking spaces, at the L.A.
11 Zoo parking lot, and that is considered to be
12 significant.

13 And then lastly, from the water quality
14 standpoint, because of the possibility of the
15 unpredictable nature of earthquakes, there is a
16 possibility that the sewers could break during an
17 earthquake and waste water getting into the ground water,
18 and that could result in significant impacts.

19 So that's an overview of the significant
20 impacts that were identified in the Environmental Impact
21 Report. There are a lot more details as well as a lot of
22 additional environmental analyses that are in the EIR,
23 and all of those are contained in Section 3 of the
24 Environmental Impact Report.

25 Okay. Next step. We're at this public hearing

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 right now, and there is one other public hearing. It's
2 going to be held tomorrow night at six o'clock at the
3 L.A. Zoo at the Witherbee Auditorium.

4 Comments on the Draft EIR are due on Monday,
5 February 27th, close of business, which will be
6 5:00 p.m., and then all of the comments that are
7 submitted to the City will then be responded to
8 officially and then will be packaged up into the final
9 Environmental Impact Report which is expected sometime in
10 the Spring of 2006. And then Staff -- City Staff is
11 expected to make a recommendation for certification of
12 the final EIR as well as for project approval in the
13 Summer of 2006.

14 And again, comments are due on February 27th.
15 You can send them to the address on the screen or e-mail
16 them to the e-mail address at the bottom of the slide.

17 Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. DOTY: Okay. Thank you very much, Louis.

19 Now it is your time to speak and our time to
20 listen. Speakers, we would appreciate it if you come up
21 and use this microphone here. Please speak distinctly,
22 start out by giving us your name, and if you represent a
23 group, the name of the group. Since we are recording
24 this for all here, if you would spell your name, that
25 would help the court reporter.

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 We'll be going off the speaker cards. So I
 2 have three here. If you have not submitted one and think
 3 you would like to speak, I encourage you to fill one out.

4 Please limit your comments to around three
 5 minutes. You can come back after everybody else had a
 6 chance to speak if you wish to do so.

7 Okay. The first speaker I have I believe is
 8 Harry McWatters.

9 MR. McWATTERS: Good morning. My name is
 10 Harry McWatters, M-C-W-A-T-T-E-R-S. I'm a resident of
 11 the Burbank Rancho area and in close proximity to the I
 12 guess what they call the Valley -- Valley Heart site
 13 where there is going to be a shaft and an air treatment
 14 facility.

15 I would like to point out that this site is
 16 used by the local residents extensively for recreational
 17 purposes, including practicing of horses and hiking and
 18 walking. I have walked through it myself numerous times
 19 during the week. I have noticed that it is not
 20 identified as a formal recreational area in the Draft
 21 EIR. I think that might be something of an oversight.

22 The property is a remnant leftover from
 23 Griffith Park after it was severed due to the
 24 construction of the 134 Freeway. It is an open space,
 25 and I think it's reasonable to consider it a formal

Response to Comment T3-1

Comment noted. Refer to response to comments AJ1-4 and AJ1-19 for an additional discussion regarding Pollywog. As described in Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR, the staff recommended GBIS Alignment does not include a shaft site or ATF at Valley Heart/Pollywog.

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

Response to Comment T3-2

Comment noted.

Response to Comment T3-3

As described in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR, in March 2005, interested Native American individuals and tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission were contracted. Information gathered during the record search, limited archival research, site inspections, and Native American consultation are summarized in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. Mitigation measures are included in the Draft EIR that include a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan that consists of Native American coordination (CUL-MM-8) and further documentation/coordination of the presence or absence of traditional cultural properties for program-level components (CUL-MM-11).

1 recreational area and one that's certainly used in that
2 way by local residents.

3 So my point would be that I think it would be
4 reasonable to consider the south alternative alignment
5 for the sewer that's going to go through there, and is a
6 more appropriate place rather than impacting this
7 particular small area which has a great deal of value to
8 the local residents.

9 MR. DOTY: Thank you.

10 Rosemary White.

11 MS. WHITE: Actually, my name is Rose Marie.

12 MR. DOTY: I apologize.

13 MS. WHITE: And it doesn't take a lot to notice
14 that I-E at the end. So anyway, my last name is spelled
15 W-H-I-T-E.

16 I have three comments. I wanted to know and I
17 haven't heard it mentioned, do you have a native American
18 representative for this project to monitor work that is
19 going to be done?

20 Secondly, I'm very concerned. I'm part of the
21 Sierra Club. I'm a chair of the Wildlife and Endangered
22 Species Committee, the Los Angeles Chapter, and National
23 Sierra Club Wildlife Committee. Our concern of course is
24 with open spaces and habitat and wild animals. We have
25 been working with the Department of Recreation and Parks

Response to Comment T3-4

As analyzed in detail in Section 3.17 of the Draft EIR, the proposed construction of a shaft site in the Los Angeles Zoo parking lot, as part of both NEIS II and GBIS components of the IRP project, would result in the displacement of approximately 225 parking spaces for several years. Even with implementation of TRA-MM-3, there could be a residual significant impact during construction. The operation of an ATF at either the Los Angeles Zoo or Observatory Annex parking lots would result in a permanent loss of 30 parking spaces. In order to reduce this potentially significant impact to a level less than significant, the project includes a mitigation measure (TRA-MM-8) that would reconfigure the Los Angeles Zoo or Observatory Annex parking lots to provide an equivalent number of spaces. Therefore, the project is not expected to have a long-term impact on the planning efforts associated with the Griffith Park Master Plan. In addition, as noted in comment O16, from the Los Angeles Zoo Department, the Pecan Grove is the preferred location for aboveground GBIS activities, which is the reason that the staff recommended GBIS Alignment includes that shaft site. Comment noted.

Response to Comment T3-5

Comment noted.

1 on the proposed master plan for Griffith Park.
2 And my concern as you began to mention the
3 possibility of taking out parking spaces in the Zoo
4 parking lot, that particular possibility would really
5 impact how the master plan is thought of and the
6 alternatives for that master plan. So I'm very concerned
7 about that.

8 The other comment is a general one, and I'll be
9 quick on this. I am concerned that there aren't -- that
10 this whole lot of room isn't full. And being a clinical
11 psychologist and dealing with motivation and persuasive
12 techniques, I would think that you might want to get
13 together perhaps with your Public Relations or with the
14 Department or someone with knowledge of how to bring
15 other people in here.

16 The IRP meetings have been groundbreaking in
17 terms of the Department of Water and Power's interface
18 with community and environmental agencies and groups.
19 And I would like to see a recognition of that in how you
20 publicize these meetings so that people can come in. For
21 instance, there is a great opportunity of some of the
22 environmental groups utilizing the time before this
23 meeting in the cafeteria to have meetings of their own,
24 you know, and networking and -- and so forth.

25 So I really want to put that out there, and I'm

Response to Comment T3-6

1 going to start pushing that because I think it's very
2 important.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. DOTY: Thank you.

5 And the last speaker I have is Gail Just.

6 MS. JUST: Hello. My name is Gail Just. I
7 live at 2515 Riverside Drive in the city of Burbank in
8 the community called Rancho.

9 My comments today for the record are in
10 reference to the GBIS, the Glendale/Burbank Interceptor
11 Sewer, and I will be referring to the north alignment,
12 one of the two possible alternatives. The north
13 alignment runs through the Rancho community and
14 necessitates the building of a sewage air filtration
15 facility in the heart of our neighborhood.

16 In reading the EIR, I was dismayed to see that
17 the writers in the review of the impact that the sewage
18 air filtration facility would have on our community had
19 omitted a very important fact. The Rancho is zoned RH;
20 that means single family residence with horse. The Draft
21 does not mention the effect of this facility on the 250
22 horses that, according to a Los Angeles Times article
23 that was written on December the 18th, are living and
24 thriving in this community. It does not speak about the
25 effect on these horses. And that does not include the

The proposed Valley Heart Shaft Site and ATF are on land designated as open space. As addressed in Section 3.12.3.3 of the Draft EIR, operation of permanent aboveground structures (i.e., ATFs) within designated open space or public facilities would not be a conforming use and would require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Therefore, the successful issuance of a CUP would reduce land use consistency impacts to less than significant. Refer to response to comment AJ1-4 for an additional discussion of potential environmental impacts at Valley Heart/Pollywog. In addition, as described in Section 1.5.2.2 of this Final EIR, the staff recommended GBIS Alignment does not include a shaft site or ATF at Valley Heart/Pollywog.

Response to Comment T3-7

Comment noted.

Response to Comment T3-8

Comment noted. Section 3.16 and Section 3.17 of the Draft EIR identifies potential recreation and parking impacts, respectively, within Griffith Park. In addition, the shaft proposed for Elysian Park was part of another sewer project that was previously analyzed in a different EIR.

Page 20

1 500 horses who are stabled at the Equestrian Center, nor
2 the numerous horses that live in the Glendale Rancho.

3 I would kindly request that the next EIR take
4 into account the horses living in the Rancho. My belief
5 is that the negative impact on these sensitive creatures
T3-6 would be unmitigatable.

7 My next concern also -- my next comment,
8 actually, is also about the zoning of my neighborhood.
9 We're the only community in the city of Burbank zoned for
10 horses. I submit that this zoning makes us unique to the
T3-7 City of Burbank. I further contend that our uniqueness
12 serves the City of Burbank. Therefore, the negative
13 impact felt by the Rancho community by the building of
14 the north alignment will, I believe, reverberate in the
15 greater community of Burbank.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. DOTY: Thank you.

18 Sallie Neubauer.

19 MS. NEUBAUER: Good morning. My name is
20 Sallie Neubauer, and that's spelled S-A-L-L-I-E
21 N-E-U-B-A-U-E-R, and I'm representing the Citizens
22 Committee to Save Elysian Park here this morning.

2T3-8 I'm disappointed in how this public hearing is
24 set up. I thought how great it was that the Department
25 had decided to include the public in something as big as

Page 21

1 this. But I come here, and I see a comment again on the
2 lack of participation here.

3 And then I asked for an agenda, and there is no
4 agenda after someone mentioned that you have agendas.
5 And then at this presentation, I thought at the very
6 least we would get an overview of the four alternatives
7 there are being presented. Because what's the point of
8 coming to a hearing like this with all the Staff here and
9 all these wonderful boards and everything unless you have
10 someone that helps you through it?

11 As anyone here knows, I'm sure, judging from
12 the size of people here, I'm sure everybody has seen an
13 EIR before. And they are like phonebooks. And so, when
14 you have a hearing like this, it's an opportunity to help
15 us through those phonebooks. And yet, here you have all
16 this -- all these Staff and all these materials here, and
17 yet we don't know anything more than what we did when we
18 walked in this door, which is extremely disappointing to
19 me, because that's why I came here.

20 So in terms of having significant comments, I
21 thought I would have some significant comments after the
22 presentation. Instead, all I can say is I'm very
23 concerned about this affecting recreation areas. I
24 understand that there is going to be disruption at the
25 current Griffith Park parking facility. On the other

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

T3-8

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

1 hand, if that's -- if that's the alternative compared to
2 putting a shaft in Elysian Park, which I know was one of
3 the alternatives considered at one point in time, then
4 always parking is better than park. But none of that has
5 been explained to us here, and I'm very disappointed
T3-8 6 about that.

7 The other thing that seems to have been blown
8 over here is the difference in capacities of these
9 alternatives. And it seems to me with all of this effort
10 being done for an extremely large project, that we should
T3-9 11 be considering the most benefits, the most beneficial
12 scenario that would include reclaiming waste water,
13 reclaiming surface runoff, et cetera, and that you picked
14 as your No. 1 alternative one that does not do the most.

15 So I have big questions about that, and none of
16 these are answered at this point in time. And I hope
T3-10 17 afterwards I will get some better enlightenment, but I'm
18 sorry that it can't be in front of everybody. You know,
19 I think that this process is extremely flawed.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. DOTY: Henry Zinniker.

22 MR. ZINNIKER: Yes. My name is Henry Zinniker.

23 I live at 1401 Morningside Drive in the Rancho area.

T3-11 24 I feel that this north alignment project will
25 not be suitable for the residents and the homeowners of

Response to Comment T3-9

Alternative 1 was identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative in the Draft EIR based on the adverse impacts identified in the EIR. CEQA requires the identification of significant impacts of a project, and because significance thresholds are predicated on adverse impacts, EIRs generally focus on adverse impacts. The Environmentally Superior Alternative, therefore, uses adverse impacts as the basis for its identification. However, all of the Project Alternatives would provide additional benefits, and these benefits have been considered in the identification of the Recommended Alternative (refer to Section 1.5 of this Final EIR).

Response to Comment T3-10

Refer to response to comment T3-9. Comment noted.

Response to Comment T3-11

Comment noted.

Response to Comment T3-12

Comment noted.

Response to Comment T3-13

As the commenter mentioned, LADWP's Conservation Program has identified various alternatives and methods to manage water. The IRP is a plan for the City of Los Angeles to provide for its future wastewater needs, while integrating water management techniques. The IRP does not limit or hinder the City from further pursuing other alternatives or methods of water conservation or management.

Comment noted.

1 Burbank, and I feel that if you look at the plans
2 closely, you will see that the south-aligned alignment
3 would be a more -- a cheaper project than the north
4 alignment.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. DOTY: Jill Gravender.

7 MS. GRAVENDER: Hi. I'm Jill Gravender,
8 G-R-A-V-E-N-D-E-R, with Environment Now, and I just have
9 two quick comments.

10 One, I certainly appreciate the effort to
11 increase the use of local water supplies rather than
12 import. And to that effect, I would encourage all L.A.
13 city agencies to analyze priorities that are not
14 currently included in the EIR, such as the value of a new
15 water supply and the reduced risk from dependence on
16 imported water.

17 Finally, on managing runoff, LADWP's
18 Conservation Program has identified a number of
19 conservation alternatives other than just sprinklers,
20 replacing sprinklers, and I would encourage DWP to
21 consider more of those options in -- or in addition to
22 the sprinklers.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. DOTY: And the last speaker card I have is
25 Jim Mequiston.

Response to Comment T3-14

Comment noted. Refer to Section 1.5 of this Final EIR regarding the identification and rationalization behind the Recommended Alternative.

1 MR. MEQUISTON: Jim Mequiston, East Hollywood
2 Community Association.

3 We have been more of us of the knowledge
4 through the process, and independently we came to
5 Alternative No. 4 as the best solution. We want to keep
6 the waste water treatment as high up in altitude as we
7 can for gravity reasons for distributing water. We're
8 also very upset about the idea of letting the Los Angeles
T3-14
9 River flow rather than corralling that water and
10 conserving it. But that's another program, not this
11 particular one.

12 So we're more or less happy that the option of
13 choice has been the Option No. 4, which we think will
14 give us the best bang for the buck.

15 MR. DOTY: Thank you.

16 I have no further speaker cards. Is there
17 anybody else who wishes to speak? Seeing none, that
18 concludes the public comment period for the hearing.

19 I again want to thank everybody for coming.

20 Before you leave, we have parking validation
21 available in the front. We don't have agendas, but we
22 have parking validations.

23 UNKNOWN: That's more important anyway.

24 MR. DOTY: I apologize for the lack of agendas.
25 I was lied to.

1 Strike that from the record.

2 The public comment period will remain open
3 until 5:00 p.m. on Monday, February 27. Until then, you
4 may submit written comments to the address on the
5 overhead slide or online. It is the e-mail address there
6 (indicating). And there is an ability to do it actually
7 on the online website.

8 Please remember to include the following
9 information: Your full name, complete address including
10 zip code, telephone number including area code, and the
11 name of your organization if you are representing an
12 organization.

13 This is the third of four public hearings. You
14 do not have to attend the fourth hearing, but you are
15 invited to do so and encouraged to encourage others to do
16 so too. Believe me, we would like as well this room to
17 be full, and we're certainly trying to do that.

18 The fourth public hearing will be on Thursday,
19 January 12th, at 6:00 p.m., in the Witherbee Auditorium
20 at 5333 Zoo Drive.

21 This public hearing is now closed. Thank you
22 very much.

23 (The public hearing concluded at 10:50 a.m.)

24 -000-

25

CALIFORNIA DEPOSITION REPORTERS, INC. - (800) 242-1996

eda0b987-24fa-49e6-ad0a-03614cda0e42

