

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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 (indicated).

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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

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

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

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 R1H;
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

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
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
11 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.

23 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

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

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
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
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
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.

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

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.

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
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

