REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER REPLENISHMENT DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
12621 E. 166th Street, Cerritos, California 90703

9:00 A.M., MONDAY, MARCH 3, 2003

AGENDA

Each item on the agenda, no matter how described, shall be deemed to include any appropriate motion, whether to adopt a minute motion, resolution, payment of any bill, approval of any matter or action, or any other action. Items listed as “For Information” or “For Discussion” may also be the subject of an “action” taken by the Board or a Committee at the same meeting.

I. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM
II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
III. INVOCATION
IV. PUBLIC COMMENT
V. ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO AGENDA
   Determine the need to add items to the agenda. In order for the Board to add an item to the agenda it must make a determination that: (i). The item came to the attention of the Board after the posting of the agenda; (ii). That there is a need for immediate action to be taken by the Board. If these two tests are met, the Board may add the item in question to the agenda for consideration consistent with the provisions of the Brown Act.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR
   Consent Calendar items are considered routine by the Board of Directors and will be adopted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Board Member or a member of the audience so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately immediately following action on the remaining items.

   A. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 3, 2003
      Recommendation: That the Board approve the minutes as submitted.
   B. SAFE DRINKING WATER PROGRAM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER COMPANY CONVERSE WELL CEQA NEGATIVE DECLARATION ADOPTION
      Recommendation: That the Board adopt a Negative Declaration for the Converse Well Treatment Project.
VII. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 03-666 -
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE WATER
REPLENISHMENT DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ORDERING
ACCEPTANCE AND FILING OF THE ENGINEERING SURVEY AND REPORT
SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 60300 OF THE WATER CODE,
DECLARING THAT FUNDS SHALL BE RAISED FOR THE PURCHASE OF
WATER FOR REPLENISHMENT AND FOR GROUNDWATER
REPLENISHMENT AND QUALITY PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS DURING
THE ENSUING FISCAL YEAR, THAT SUCH FUNDS SHALL BE RAISED BY A
REPLENISHMENT ASSESSMENT AS PROVIDED IN SAID WATER CODE,
DECLARING THAT THE FUNDS TO BE RAISED BY SAID REPLENISHMENT
ASSESSMENT WILL BENEFIT, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, ALL OF
THE PERSONS, REAL PROPERTY AND IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE
DISTRICT, AND ORDERING THE PUBLICATION OF A NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 60306 OF THE WATER CODE
Recommendation: That the Board receive and file the 2003 Engineering Survey
and Report, and adopt Resolution No. 03-666.

VIII. MEMORANDUM CONCERNING COOPERATIVE UNDERTAKINGS BETWEEN
THE WATER REPLENISHMENT DISTRICT AND WEST BASIN MUNICIPAL
WATER DISTRICT
Recommendation: For discussion and possible adoption.

IX. WEST BASIN RECYCLED WATER PURCHASE AGREEMENT
Recommendation: For discussion and possible adoption.

X. LEGISLATIVE REPORT
Recommendation: For information.

XI. GENERAL MANAGER’S REPORT

XII. DISTRICT COUNSEL REPORT

XIII. DIRECTORS’ REPORTS / COMMITTEE REPORTS

XIV. WRD BOARD MEETING DATES
A March 17, 2003 – 9:00 A.M. – Board of Directors Meeting

Beginning in April, 2003, Board meetings will be held on the first and third
Wednesday of each month at 2:00 P.M. Because meeting dates and times are
subject to change, please phone (562) 921-5521 or visit [www.wrd.org] for the
latest meeting schedules.
B. April 2, 2003 – 2:00 P.M. – Board of Directors Meeting
C. April 16, 2003 – 2:00 P.M. – Board of Directors Meeting
D. May 7, 2003 – 2:00 P.M. – Board of Directors Meeting

XV. CLOSED SESSION
   A. Existing litigation per Government Code §54956.9 (a)
      1. WRD vs Midland Park Water Trust; L.A.S.C. Case No. 01-CO-1417
      2. Central and West Basin Water Replenishment District vs Charles Adams; L.A.S.C. Case No. 786,656
   B. Anticipated litigation per Government Code §54956.9(b)
      Three Cases
   C. Labor Negotiations per Government Code §54957.6
      Negotiator: Arnoldo Beltran
      Bargaining Group: American Federation of State County & Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
      Discussion: Terms and conditions for Memorandum of Understanding for bargaining group

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

Agenda posted by Marcia A. Forkos, Deputy Secretary, February 26, 2003. In compliance with ADA requirements, this document can be made available in alternative formats upon request.
A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Water Replenishment District was held on February 3, 2003, at 9:00 A.M. in the District office at 12621 E. 166th Street, Cerritos, California. President Willard H. Murray, Jr. called the meeting to order and presided. Deputy Secretary Marcia A. Forkos recorded the minutes.

I. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM
The President declared a quorum of Directors was present, which in addition to himself included Directors Pat Acosta, Robert W. Goldsworthy, Albert Robles and Norm Ryan. Also participating in the meeting were General Manager Bruce Mowry, Assistant General Manager and District Engineer Robb Whitaker, District Counsels J. Arnoldo Beltrán and Edward Casey, and Government and Public Affairs Representative Adeline Yoong.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Director Ryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. INVOCATION
Director Gary Morse of Central Basin Municipal Water District (CBMWD) gave the Invocation.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT
None.

V. ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO THE AGENDA
President Murray stated that he would like to add an item to the agenda concerning the District’s reserve fund policy, that there was a need to take immediate action to discuss this item at the request
of a legislator, and the need arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda for this meeting.

Director Robles stated that he does not see the urgency in discussing this item since the proposed legislation can be submitted to the legislator in draft form. He apologized that he was not present at the last Board meeting when this was discussed but asked that the Board give him a chance to review the proposed policy.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Goldsworthy, seconded by President Murray, and with Director Robles dissenting, it was

RESOLVED: That the Board determines that there is a need to take immediate action to discuss and act upon the item concerning the District's Reserve Fund Policy, and that this need arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda for this meeting.

V.A. **DISTRICT RESERVE FUND POLICY**

Director Ryan stated that the Board at its last meeting had recommended that the Finance Committee review options available for the District to be able to increase reserves without increasing the assessment. Director Acosta concurred.

Mr. Jim Glancy, WRD Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Chairperson, stated that his main concern is the amount set aside for the overdraft fund since there are limits to the amount of water purchases per the Judgment.

Mr. Mike Gutierrez, Southern California Water Company, stated that it would be difficult to make a comment at this time since this item was not on the agenda.
Director Robles asked that the Board reconsider its decision and delay action on this item until the public and he had a chance to review it. He stated that the original proposed language was different from what is before them and he would like to be able to review what the changes were.

Director Acosta stated that Senator Martha Escutia had asked that the Board adopt a policy on its reserves so she could introduce it on behalf of the District. This legislation would change the existing $10 million cap on the District’s reserves.

Director Goldsworthy stated that the previous Finance Committee and Administrative Committee, of which he was the Chair, had reviewed this item and had made the recommendation to increase the District’s reserves per the State Auditors’ findings.

Director Ryan stated that he would like to assure Director Robles and the TAC that the language had been removed regarding increasing of the assessment and regarding a relationship between reserves and the assessment. He noted that the Finance Committee will explore options on how to reach the reserve amount.

Ms. Hazel Scotto, Downey League of Women Voters, requested a copy of the previous Board handout on this item.

Mr. Diem Vuong, Long Beach Water Department, stated that he felt that there was duplication since water purchases are reflected in three different funds.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Acosta, seconded by Director Ryan, and with Director Robles dissenting, it was
RESOLVED: That the Board adopts a policy to accumulate and set aside funds as recommended by the Bureau of State Audits and defined by staff and a third-party financial consultant.

VI.  CONSENT CALENDAR

A.  JUNE 30, 2002 INDEPENDENT AUDIT REPORTS

This item was taken off the Consent Calendar.

Director Robles asked that Agenda Item VI.A be removed from the Consent Calendar. He asked that staff make a presentation on highlights of the Audit Reports.

Controller of Finance and Administration Robert Martin stated that the District had received an “unqualified” rating from the District’s independent auditor’s Teaman, Ramirez, and Smith. He stated that means there were no reportable findings that were necessary, which is good. Mr. Martin stated that the present auditors performed the audit on the District’s financial statements and single audit report of federal funds and complied with Water Code requirements. He also noted that the audit reports are on the District’s website, www.wrd.org.

The Board received and filed the District’s Financial Statements and Single Audit Report for the year ended June 30, 2002.

VII. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 03-663 – A RESOLUTION OF INTENTION TO APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT BETWEEN THE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEM AND THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS WATER REPLENISHMENT DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

This item was taken off the agenda and referred back to the Administrative Committee. There were no objections from the Board.
President Murray stated that the former Administrative Committee recommended that WRD upgrade its retirement benefits to 2.7% at 55 from 2% at 55. The present Administrative Committee at its January 29th meeting recommended upgrading the plan to 3% at 60.

VIII. AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES BETWEEN THE WATER REPLENISHMENT DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND BRIAN J. BRADY & ASSOCIATES

President Murray asked if there was a need to put this item out to bid. District Counsel Ed Casey stated that in accordance with the District’s procurement policy, this item will be taken up at the next Board meeting.

IX. STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

Assistant General Manager and District Engineer Robb Whitaker stated that the updated flowchart handed out to the Board members included revisions made from staff meeting with the Ad Hoc Planning Committee composed of Directors Acosta and Goldsworthy and feedback from the TAC.

Planning Engineer Jason Weeks added that individual meetings with Directors will be scheduled at a later date.

Director Acosta asked TAC Chairperson Jim Glancy to report on the TAC’s recommendations. Mr. Glancy stated that the TAC looked at the schedules and made some adjustments. He reported that the TAC recommended completing a one-year CIP and the five-year CIP after that.

X. LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Government and Public Affairs Manager Adeline Yoong provided state and federal updates. She stated that the Senate had approved a budget for the Bureau of Reclamations of which the Leo J. Vander Lans Treatment Facility is a part of. No committee assignments have been made.
XI. WEST BASIN RECYCLED WATER PURCHASE AGREEMENT

President Murray asked District Counsel Casey what the implications are now that the District is without a recycled water contract with West Basin Municipal Water District (WBMWD). District Counsel Casey stated that the District will be operating per the 1967 Agreement between the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and WRD wherein the County will purchase imported water for injection, and that this water must be suitable to meet the quality, quantity, and price considerations acceptable to WRD.

President Murray stated that at the last Board meeting, it was determined that the WRD will pay approximately $300,000 more a year purchasing water from the County. He asked what the benefit was with the Agreement.

General Manager Mowry stated that in the long-term, the District gains more flexibility because there will be few limitations, resulting in a reduction of expenditures and lower assessments.

Director Ryan stated that WBMWD should not have offered a take it or leave it contract with the recycled water price of $510/AF since that is the cost of MWD water. He made a motion for WRD to enter into an agreement with WBMWD for a recycled water price of $470/AF for 30 days, request a meeting, and continue negotiations.

Director Robles asked Director Acosta to repeat the motion she made at the previous Board meeting regarding this agreement, as a substitute motion.

Director Acosta made a motion to extend the January 1998 contract with WBMWD on recycled water under the same terms for a period of one year and to continue negotiations with WBMWD with the hope that an agreement could be reached before the end of the one year period. She stated that the District is undergoing a strategic planning process at the moment and would like to be able
use that information in determining a water a water purchase agreement. Director Robles seconded.

Director Ryan stated that the term of one year would hamper WBMWD’s ability to refinance and preclude grant possibilities.

Director Robles stated that due diligence must be undertaken and a shot-gun approach must not be done.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Acosta, seconded by Director Robles, and called by roll call vote, it was

RESOLVED: That the Board extends the January 1998 contract with WBMWD on recycled water under the same terms for a period of one year and continue negotiations with WBMWD with the hope that an agreement could be reached before the end of the one year period.

AYES: Directors Acosta, Goldsworthy, Robles
NOES: Directors Murray, Ryan

WBMWD Director Ed Little stated that the offer was not acceptable since they are presently paying over $510/AF so he asked why they would settle for $430/AF. He commented that it did not make a lot of sense not to buy recycled water which was far better quality than imported water and that this delay was costing everyone a lot of money.

Director Goldsworthy responded by saying that the quality of recycled water is subjective, that the delay was not costing anyone, and that there was no economics that would justify the $510/AF to finance the recycled water plant.
President Murray stated that a meeting will be set-up with WBMWD’s Ad Hoc Committee.

XII. GENERAL MANAGER’S REPORT
General Manager Mowry stated that he received an invitation from WBMWD Director Carol Kwan to the Chinese Chamber of Commerce’s New Year festival on Saturday, February 8th and would like to extend the invitation to the Board.

XIII. DISTRICT COUNSEL REPORT
Deferred to closed session.

XIV. DIRECTORS’ REPORTS/COMMITTEE REPORTS
Director Robles encouraged the Board members to consider shortening the length of time of the Board meetings and to encourage public comment.

President Murray announced the formation of a new Ad Hoc Committee on Audits, both for State and Independent, composed of Director Goldsworthy as Chairman and Director Ryan.

XV. WRD BOARD MEETING DATES
A. February 24, 2003 – 9:00 A.M. – WRD Board of Directors Meeting (Rescheduled from 2/17/03 due to the President’s Day holiday.)
B. March 3, 2003 – 9:00 A.M. – WRD Board of Directors Meeting
C. March 17, 2003 – 9:00 A.M. – WRD Board of Directors Meeting
D. April 7, 2003 – 9:00 A.M. – WRD Board of Directors Meeting

XVI. CLOSED SESSION
A. Existing litigation per Government Code §54956.9
   1. WRD vs Midland Park Water Trust; L.A.S.C. Case No. 01-CO-1417
   2. Central and West Basin Water Replenishment District vs Charles Adams; LASC Case No. 786,656

B. Anticipated litigation per Government Code §54956.9 (b): Two Cases
Anticipated litigation per Government Code §54956.9 (c): One Case

C. Conference with real property negotiator per Government Code §54956.8
Real Property: Leased properties under the Desalter Lease include those certain parcels of real property and improvements commonly known as:
1. California Water Service (CWS) Station No. 25, Assessor’s Parcel Number 7528-004-003 (the “Plant Site”)
2. CWS Site 21-01, Assessor’s Parcel Number 7517-038-001 (“Well Site #1”)
3. CWS Site 21-02, Assessor’s Parcel Number 7517-038-004

Negotiating Parties: Bruce Mowry (District Negotiator) and Terry Tamble (California Water Service)
Under Negotiation: Proposed cancellation of leases and related agreements

The Board went into closed session. The Board reconvened in open session.

District Counsel Beltrán reported that no action was taken on the cases.

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT

President Murray asked if there was any further business to come before the Board and there being none, the meeting was adjourned in memory of the Columbia Shuttle astronauts. President Murray requested a brief moment of silence.

__________________________________________
President

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
Secretary
AGENDA ITEM NO. VI.B

DATE: MARCH 3, 2003

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BRUCE A. MOWRY, GENERAL MANAGER

SUBJECT: SAFE DRINKING WATER PROGRAM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER COMPANY CONVERSE WELL CEQA NEGATIVE DECLARATION ADOPTION

The Southern California Water Company (SCWC) Well located at the corner of Converse and Gage Avenue in an incorporated area of Los Angeles is currently affected by Carbon Tetrachloride (CTC) and Trichloroethylene (TCE), two volatile organic compounds (VOCs), at levels exceeding the maximum contaminant level allowed by the State of California Department of Health Services. The well is currently offline due to the contamination. The Southern California Water Company has requested assistance from WRD through the Safe Drinking Water Program to install a treatment system to treat the well and return it to service. In addition, SCWC has requested consideration to use the treatment vessels from the Hoffman project at the Converse well location. SCWC will be the lead agency, procuring all contracts in accordance with WRD’s current contract policy. WRD will make progress payments upon submittal of invoices by SCWC for an amount not to exceed $300,000.

The facility will be built within the boundaries of the well site owned and operated by the Southern California Water Company, whose personnel will perform the routine operation and maintenance associated with wellhead treatment system. The system will have the capacity to treat the full flow of the well. The treated water will be disinfected prior to entering the distribution system.

The wellhead treatment system will consist of one complete granular activated carbon unit. A permit to construct and operate will be obtained from the California Department of Health Services and a discharge permit (if needed) will be obtained from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to the construction of the facility.

WRD staff has prepared an Initial Study that concludes that no significant environmental impact is expected from the project.
Per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines, the attached environmental documentation in the form of an initial study has been prepared and a public notice has been posted. The 30-day public review period ended December 11, 2002. No comments were received.

The Groundwater Clean-Up Committee reviewed this item on January 29, 2003 and concurred with staff’s recommendation.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The construction cost of the Converse Wellhead facility is estimated not to exceed $300,000, an amount contained in the 2001-02 budget. The Southern California Water Company has agreed to participate with additional funding should the project exceed the current budget allocated for this project.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the Board adopt a Negative Declaration for the Converse Well Treatment Project.
ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

FOR

INSTALLATION OF GRANULAR ACTIVATED CARBON FILTERS FOR TREATMENT OF VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS

FOR

SCWC CONVERSE WELL 1
Located in
FLORENCE, CALIFORNIA

A WRD Safe Drinking Water Program Project

November 2002
Interested Agencies, Organizations and Individuals

NOTICE OF COMPLETION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE INITIAL STUDY/PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE WELLHEAD TREATMENT CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

The Water Replenishment District of Southern California (WRD) has prepared a negative declaration for the Wellhead Treatment Construction of Converse Well No. 1 for review and comment by the public and local agencies.

The Water Replenishment District of Southern California (WRD) encompasses the urban coastal plain of Los Angeles County. WRD is a special district vested with the responsibility to manage and protect the groundwater supplies of the Central and West Coast Basins.

As part of its Clean Water Programs, WRD has developed a Safe Drinking Water Program designed to provide wellhead treatment to pumpers with affected wells. This enables the pumper to keep an affected well on-line or to bring an otherwise shut down well back on-line and assists in WRD’s effort to clean up existing groundwater contamination at that particular site.

The wellhead treatment system will consist of one complete granular activated carbon unit. A permit to construct and operate will be obtained from the California Department of Health Services and a discharge permit (if needed) will be obtained from the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to the construction of the facility.

The facility will be built within the boundaries of the well site owned and operated by Southern California Water Company (SCWC). Southern California Water Company personnel will perform the routine operation and maintenance associated with this wellhead treatment unit. The system will have the capacity to treat the full flow of the well. The treated water will be disinfected with a chlorination system prior to entering the distribution system.

Written comments must be received by December 11, 2002. All written responses to this notice should be sent to:

Kavous Emami, PE
Manager of Operations & Construction
Water Replenishment District of Southern California
12621 East 166th Street
Cerritos, CA 90703

Copies of the document will be available for review at the Water Replenishment District of Southern California.
PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

WATER REPLENISHMENT DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
SAFE DRINKING WATER PROGRAM AT CONVERSE WELL 1

PROJECT NAME
Construction of Wellhead Treatment Unit for Converse Well 1

ENTITY UNDERTAKING PROJECT
Water Replenishment District of Southern California.

LOCATION
The Converse well site is located in Florence at 6360 Converse Avenue, Los Angeles County.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
As part of its Clean Water Programs, WRD has developed a Safe Drinking Water Program designed to provide wellhead treatment to pumpers with affected wells. This enables the pumper to keep an affected well on-line or to bring an otherwise shut down well back on-line and assists in WRD’s effort to clean up existing groundwater contamination by pumping and treating at that particular site.

Southern California Water Company (SCWC) owns and operates Converse Well No. 1 which is currently affected by volatile organic compound (VOC) contamination. This well, located in Florence, Los Angeles County has surpassed the maximum contaminant levels (MCL) of 0.5 parts per billion for Carbon Tetrachloride (CTC) and 5 parts per billion for Trichloroethylene (TCE). The Converse wellhead treatment facility will utilize a Liquid Phase Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) system. A permit to operate the treatment system will be obtained from the California Department of Health Services and a discharge permit (if needed) will be obtained from the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to construction of the facility. This facility will be built within the boundaries of the well site owned by the Southern California Water Company. The system will have the capacity to treat the full flow of the Converse Well #1. The treated water will be disinfected with a chlorination system prior to entering the distribution system. Southern California Water Company personnel will perform the routine operation and maintenance associated with this wellhead treatment unit.

FINDING
The Water Replenishment District of Southern California (WRD) Board of Directors having heard, at a public meeting of the District, the comments of any and all concerned persons or entities, including the recommendations of the District staff, does hereby find that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. The facts supporting this finding are presented in the attached Initial Environmental Study (IES) prepared for this project and in the
reference material cited in the IES. When considering the record as a whole, there is no evidence before the agency that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife resources or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. The analysis and findings contained in the IES and this Declaration represent the independent judgment of the District.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Water Replenishment District of Southern California held on March 3, 2003.

_____________________________
Willard Murray, President

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Robert Goldsworthy, Secretary
INITIAL STUDY

BACKGROUND

1. Name of Proponent(s):
   Water Replenishment District of Southern California
   Southern California Water Company

2. Name of Lead Agency:
   Water Replenishment District of Southern California

3. Address and phone number of Lead Agency:
   12621 East 166th Street
   Cerritos, California 90701
   (562) 921-5521

4. Date of Initial Study:
   June 6, 2002

PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Description of the project:

   The Water Replenishment District of Southern California (WRD) encompasses the urban coastal plain of Los Angeles County. WRD is a special district vested with the responsibility to manage and protect the groundwater supplies of the Central and West Coast Basins.

   Currently, some water wells in the WRD service area are affected by groundwater contamination. Southern California Water Company (SCWC) owns and operates Converse Well No. 1, which is currently affected by volatile organic compound (VOC) contamination. This well has surpassed the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of 0.5 parts per billion for Carbon Tetrachloride (CTC) and 5 parts per billion for Trichloroethylene (TCE) and is currently off-line.

   As part of its Clean Water Programs, WRD has developed a Safe Drinking Water Program designed to provide wellhead treatment to pumpers with affected wells. This enables the pumper to keep an affected well on-line or to bring an otherwise shut down well back on-line and assists in WRD’s effort to clean up existing groundwater contamination by pumping and treating at that particular site.
Converse Well No. 1 is located at 6360 Converse Avenue. The well site is in a residential area. The north side of the property is adjacent to Gage Avenue.

The Converse wellhead treatment unit will consist of a Liquid Phase Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) system. Liquid Phase GAC treatment is a technology used to remove organic contaminants from the groundwater. Groundwater is pumped through one or more vessels containing GAC. Thermal processing of carbon creates small porous particles with a large internal surface area. This attribute makes it activated. The activated carbon attracts and absorbs the contaminant molecules, allowing water to pass through the vessels relatively quickly. When the carbon is exhausted from the vessel, the carbon must be replaced. The spent carbon is replaced with newly activated carbon. A permit to operate the treatment system will be obtained from the California Department of Health Services.

This facility will be built within the boundaries of the well site owned and operated by Southern California Water Company. The system will have the capacity to treat the full flow of the well. The treated water will be disinfected with a chlorination system prior to entering the distribution system.

SCWC personnel will perform the routine operation and maintenance associated with this wellhead treatment unit.

2. Identification of the environmental setting:

The well site is located on a .38 acre lot at 6360 Converse Avenue, adjacent to Gage Avenue. The well site is bordered by residential property. See attached site map.

3. Identification of environmental effects:

See attached Environmental Checklist.

4. Discussion of ways to mitigate any significant effects identified:

No significant effects were identified in the Initial Study.

5. Examination of whether or not the project is compatible with existing zoning, plans, and other land use controls:

Appropriate use, construction and operating permit applications will be filed with the appropriate agencies.

6. Name(s) of person(s) who prepared or participated in the Initial Study:

Robb Whitaker, PE
Assistant General Manager / District Engineer
Water Replenishment District of Southern California
12621 East 166th Street
Cerritos, California 90703
(562) 921-5521

Kavous Emami, PE
Manager of Operations and Construction
Water Replenishment District of Southern California
12621 East 166th Street
Cerritos, California 90703
(562) 921-5521

Charlene King
Assistant Engineer
Water Replenishment District of Southern California
12621 East 166th Street
Cerritos, California 90703
(562) 921-5521

Dianne Gehling
Water Quality Technician III
Southern California Water Company
12035 Burke Street, Suite 1
Santa Fe Springs, California 90670
(562) 907-9200 ext. 402

Hank Aceves
Water Supply Superintendent
Southern California Water Company
12035 Burke Street, Suite 1
Santa Fe Springs, California 90670
(562) 907-9200 ext. 401
Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title: SCWC Converse Well No. 1 Wellhead Treatment Facility Project

2. Lead agency name and address:
   Water Replenishment District of Southern California
   12621 E. 166th Street, Cerritos, CA 90703

3. Contact person and phone number: Ms. Charlene King (562) 921-5521

4. Project location: 6360 Converse Avenue, Florence, LA County

5. Project sponsor’s name and address:
   Water Replenishment District of Southern California
   12621 E. 166th Street, Cerritos, CA 90703

6. General plan designation: Utility Site

7. Zoning: Residential

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
   This site is an existing water supply utility site owned by the Southern California Water Company (SCWC). See Initial Study—Section 2 (Project Information)
   The proposed activities include the following items:
   1. Modify the existing piping
   2. Installation of one complete granular activated carbon filtration system & associated piping

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project’s surroundings)
   This existing site is in a residential area that is adjacent to Gage Avenue.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement.)

   California Department of Health Services

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture Resources ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality ☐ Land Use/Planning
☐ Mineral Resources ☐ Noise ☐ Population/Housing
☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation ☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Utilities/Service Systems ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Kavous Emami, Manager of Operations & Construction
Printed name

For: Water Replenishment District of Southern California

11/15/02
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance
SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. AESTHETICS—Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

III. AIR QUALITY—Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? □ □ ☑ □

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? □ □ ☑ □

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? □ □ ☑ □

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? □ □ □ ☑

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? □ □ □ ☑

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? □ □ □ ☑

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? □ □ □ ☑

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? □ □ □ ☑

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? □ □ □ ☑

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? □ □ □ ☑
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

iv) Landslides? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? □ □ ☑ □

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? □ □ ☑ □

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? □ □ ☑ □

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? □ □ ☑ □

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? □ □ ☑ □

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? □ □ □ ☑

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? □ □ □ ☑

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? □ □ □ ☑

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? □ □ □ ☑

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING—Would the project:
a) Physically divide an established community? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

X. MINERAL RESOURCES—Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

XI. NOISE—Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING—Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?  

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- Fire protection?
- Police protection?
- Schools?
- Parks?
- Other public facilities?

XIV. RECREATION—

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC—Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?  

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?  

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?  

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?  

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This section considers impacts of the proposed project, including short- and long-term impacts of project actions (construction and operation), and indirect (secondary) impacts from project actions. The analysis presented in this section evaluates whether or not there is potential for significant environmental impacts to occur as a result of the proposed project. This section, as with all sections in this document, is structured to conform to environmental documentation requirements.

For each issue area, a description of thresholds of significance is provided. These thresholds provide guidance in the Lead Agency’s determination as to whether there is potential for significant effects on the environment. One of the following four responses is provided for each issue with regard to the significance of any identified environmental effects:

- **g) No Impact.** The proposed project will not have any measurable impact on the environmental factor being analyzed (e.g., the project will not discharge into a municipal drinking water supply, therefore there will be no impacts on drinking water quality).

- **h) Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project will have the potential for impacting the environmental factor under consideration, although this impact will be below established thresholds (e.g., the project will result in discharge to surface waters, but it is not expected that such discharge will result in exceedance of established water quality standards).

- **i) Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed project will have the potential to generate impacts that result in exceedance of the threshold significance criteria, but measures such as a change in project design will mitigate such impacts to levels that are less than significant.

- **j) Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project will have impacts that are considered significant. Additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Generally, the above responses are considered only in relation to adverse impacts of a project. It is possible that a project may have one or more beneficial impacts on the resource in question, and discussion of mitigation is not meaningful. In such cases, beneficial impacts are identified in the analysis but are evaluated to be less than significant for purposes of the Environmental Checklist. An explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
CEQA Supplemental Information – Impact Analysis

The following sections provide explanation of responses to the referenced Checklist questions.

I. Aesthetics

A, B, C, and D.

No Impact. The project will be built within an enclosed existing well site and will not impact aesthetic resources or affect the existing visual character of the area.

II. Agriculture Resources

A, B, and C.

No Impact. The project site is not located in an agricultural use area, therefore this issue is not applicable.

III. Air Quality

Significance Criteria

Project actions are evaluated in reference to the following:

A. Conflict with or obstruction of implementation of an applicable air quality plan;
B. Violation of any ambient air quality standard, or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation;
C. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard;
D. Exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants;
E. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

In addition, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has established emissions thresholds for a number of criteria pollutants. These thresholds apply to both short-term (construction-related) emissions and long-term (operational emissions).

A, B, C, and D.

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the project would generate short-term exhaust emissions from construction equipment and motor vehicles. Excavation and compaction of soil for the laying of pipe and the installation of concrete base pads will be required, and based on AQMD Rule 403 FUGITIVE DUST, this as well as other site preparation activities would generate fugitive dust of a short-term, temporary nature. However, the short-term emissions from vehicles and fugitive dust are not expected to violate South Coast Air Quality Management District’s existing or projected air quality standards, nor affect a potentially sensitive receptor (dwellings) located adjacent to the project site.
The GAC facility is a closed treatment system, therefore, there will be no impact to air emissions during normal operations.

E.

No Impact. The GAC facility is a closed treatment system and it is not possible for objectionable odors to be released. No impact will occur.

IV. Biological Resources

A, B, C, D, E, and F.

No Impact. The project site is located in an urban area on an existing well site that has been previously cleared and leveled, and is not located in a conservation plan area. No impacts to biological resources will occur.

V. Cultural Resources

A, B, C, and D.

No Impact. The project site is located on an existing water facility and will not impact historical, paleontological, or archaeological resources.

VI. Geology and Soils

A, C, and D.

No Impact. The project site is located on an existing water facility site, upon which a well and related facilities have already been constructed. The site is not located within a fault zone, landslide area, or area of expansive soils, therefore no exposure of people or structures to these hazards will occur.

B.

Less Than Significant Impact. If construction is delayed into the winter season, site preparation would potentially result in some soil erosion due to runoff. In this case, standard erosion control procedures will be in place and erosion impacts will be less than significant.

E.

No Impact. The project will not affect the ability of the soil to adequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, therefore this issue is not applicable.

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A, B, and C.

Less Than Significant Impact.
Chlorine has been, and will continue to be used for disinfection of treated drinking water. The solution is classified as a corrosive liquid. Accidental release of chlorine has been evaluated and is addressed in the “Hazardous Materials Business Plan” on file with Los Angeles County Fire Department. The storage tank of the Chlorine solution has a secondary container as required by the Uniform Fire Code, which is designed to prevent the release of the solution into the environment. Transport and handling of the solution will follow specified handling procedures and OSHA requirements. Therefore no significant hazard to the public or personnel is expected.

On a periodic basis, spent carbon from the GAC facility will need to be replaced with newly activated carbon. Due to the fact that the carbon filter will be used to remove carbon tetrachloride, trichloroethylene, and tetrachloroethylene from groundwater, it is anticipated that the spent carbon will have these contaminants. Handling, transportation, and disposal of the spent carbon will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes with regard to the contaminants, therefore no significant hazard to the public or personnel is expected.

D, E, F, and H.

No Impact. The site is not located on a hazardous materials site, nor is it located within two miles of an airport, nor in the vicinity of a private airstrip or wildland area, therefore these issues are not applicable.

G.

Less Than Significant Impact. Site preparation and construction may temporarily result in an increase in traffic in the immediate vicinity of the project site, due to entry/exit of construction vehicles. However it is not expected that this temporary condition will impair or physically interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans of the nearby high school or businesses of the area.

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

A, G, H, I, and J.

No Impact. A discharge permit will be obtained from the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to the construction of the facility. The project is not located in a flood hazard area or area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impacts to water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or exposure of people or structures to floods and related hazards will occur.

B.

Less Than Significant Impact. The project will enable a groundwater extraction well that is currently off-line to go on-line; therefore groundwater extraction from the water table will be incrementally increased. However, this incremental increase is not expected to exceed that which existed prior to the well contamination when the well was on-line.
C, D, E, and F.

**Less Than Significant Impact.** If construction is delayed into the winter season, site preparation would potentially result in some soil erosion due to runoff. Excavation and compaction of soil for the laying of pipe and the installation of concrete base pads will also be required. In this case, standard erosion control procedures will be in place and impacts on water quality will be less than significant. The facility, after construction, will result in no increase in the amount of impervious surface on the site and therefore in surface runoff. The facility will connect to an existing stormwater system; however, impacts to drainage, stormwater systems, and water quality are not expected to be significant.

**IX. Land Use and Planning**

A, B, and C.

**No Impact.** The project is located on an existing well site that will not conflict with general plan designation or zoning. The project site will be compatible with existing land use and have no impact on the physical arrangement of an established community. There is no habitat or natural community conservation plan that is applicable to the site location.

**X. Mineral Resources**

**No Impact.** There are no valuable or locally important mineral resources on the site and therefore the project will not impact these resources.

**XI. Noise**

A, C, D.

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The noise generated from construction and operation of this facility will be common noise for pipeline and water facility construction and operation. Construction noises will be short-term and will occur only during normal working hours. The temporary additional noise from the construction associated with this project, and periodic noise associated with personnel vehicles and other activities required for maintenance and operation of the facility, are not expected to be significant compared to existing noise levels from the current site use.

B, E, F.

**No Impact.** The project will not generate groundborne noise, nor is it located within two miles of an airport or in the vicinity of an airstrip, therefore these issues are not applicable.

**XII. Population and Housing**

**No Impact.** Project personnel will not reside on the project site, nor will construction of the facility displace people or housing.
XIII. Public Services

A.

No Impact. The project will not require personnel to reside on site, or result in potential for fire or public safety hazard. Therefore the project will not alter existing services, or require new facilities, for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. No impacts to these services will occur.

XIV. Recreation

A, B.

No Impact. The project will not require personnel to reside on site or otherwise create conditions under which existing parks and other recreational facilities would be utilized. No impacts to these resources will occur.

XV. Transportation/Traffic

A, B, E.

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction and site preparation will potentially generate a temporary increase in traffic on Converse & Gage Avenue due to entry/exit of construction vehicles to/from the project site. However, this temporary condition is not expected to significantly affect existing traffic loads and capacity of the street system, levels of service, or emergency access on Gage Avenue. The contractor will be required to adhere to all safety measures including but not limited to a special person designated to direct entry/exit traffic.

C, D, F, and G.

No Impact. The project will not affect air traffic patterns or increase hazards due to design features. All maintenance and operation personnel will park on site on a temporary basis as needed. The project will not require any increase in parking capacity of the area or result in inadequate parking capacity. The project will not conflict with alternative transportation policies, plans, or programs.

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

A, D, and E.

No Impact. The project will not generate wastewater, or require new water supplies or entitlements, therefore impacts to these resources will not occur.

B and C.

Less Than Significant Impact. The project consists of construction of a new water treatment facility in order to address an existing problem of water contamination. The construction is therefore expected to have beneficial environmental effects. The facility will result in no
increase in impervious surface and therefore runoff from the site. This facility will require connecting to the existing storm water drainage system. A discharge permit will be obtained from the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to the construction of the facility.

F and G.

**Less Than Significant Impact.** On a periodic basis, spent carbon from the GAC facility will need to be replaced with newly activated carbon. Due to the fact that the carbon filter will be used to remove carbon tetrachloride and trichloroethylene from groundwater, it is anticipated that the spent carbon will have this contaminant. Disposal of the spent carbon will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes with regard to this contaminant, and is not expected to significantly affect the capacity of the disposal facility to which it is transported.

XVII. **Mandatory Findings of Significance**

A.

**No Impact.** The CEQA Guidelines require a discussion of potential cumulative impacts that could result from a proposed project in conjunction with others in the vicinity. The cumulative impact of several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects. (Guidelines Section 15355).

The vicinity is defined by the immediate areas surrounding the proposed project site. Based on past and current similar projects, this project should have no incremental effect and thus is not significant. The environmental conditions would essentially be the same whether or not the proposed project is implemented.

The project will have a beneficial impact on the environment by treating an existing water contamination problem, and therefore will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.

B and C.

**Less Than Significant.** Project construction, operation, and maintenance has the potential to cause temporary and/or periodic effects on fugitive dust, soil erosion, and traffic, but these effects are expected to be negligible in comparison to the existing conditions of this urbanized environment. Adverse project impacts, whether direct or indirect, on the environment and on human beings will be less than significant.
AGENDA ITEM NO. VII

DATE: MARCH 3, 2003
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: BRUCE MOWRY, GENERAL MANAGER
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 03-666-
A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE WATER
REPLENISHMENT DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ORDERING ACCEPTANCE AND FILING OF THE ENGINEERING
SURVEY AND REPORT SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 60300
OF THE WATER CODE, DECLARING THAT FUNDS SHALL BE
RAISED FOR THE PURCHASE OF WATER FOR REPLENISHMENT
AND FOR GROUNDWATER REPLENISHMENT AND QUALITY
PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS DURING THE ENSUING FISCAL
YEAR, THAT SUCH FUNDS SHALL BE RAISED BY A
REPLENISHMENT ASSESSMENT AS PROVIDED IN SAID WATER
CODE, DECLARING THAT THE FUNDS TO BE RAISED BY SAID
REPLENISHMENT ASSESSMENT WILL BENEFIT, EITHER DIRECTLY
OR INDIRECTLY, ALL OF THE PERSONS, REAL PROPERTY AND
IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE DISTRICT, AND ORDERING THE
PUBLICATION OF A NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING IN
ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 60306 OF THE WATER CODE

On January 27, 2003 the Board passed Resolution Number 03-662 ordering the
preparation of the annual Engineering Survey and Report required by Water Code
Section 60300. Staff has completed this report and submitted it to the Board to receive
and file. The receipt and filing of the Engineering Survey and Report is a required
Board action that precedes the determination as to whether funds are needed for a
replenishment assessment in the ensuing year. The report may be subsequently
amended as analysis and comments from Staff, the Board, and the public are made in
the weeks following the receive and file action.
As required by the Water Code, the report contains information on the groundwater conditions in the Central and West Coast basins for the previous, current, and ensuing water years. The report determines the amount of groundwater overdraft that will occur within the District in the ensuing year, and estimates the quantity and cost of supplemental water needed for artificial replenishment to overcome this overdraft. The report also describes the necessary projects and programs for groundwater replenishment and water quality activities within the District to meet the requirements of the water code to ensure adequate supplies of high quality groundwater in the basins.

The *Engineering Survey and Report* will be mailed out to all District pumpers and other interested parties following the receive and file action by the Board. WRD will conduct the required Public Hearing by the second Tuesday in April to review the findings in the *Engineering Survey and Report* and to present the preliminary budget so that any interested party has the opportunity to provide comment. The Board may continue the Public Hearing to another date if additional time is needed so long as it is closed by the first Tuesday in May. After the close of the public hearing, but no later than the second Tuesday in May, the Board, by Resolution, must set the Replenishment Assessment for the ensuing year.

In conjunction with the acceptance of the *Engineering Survey and Report*, the Board is required to adopt a resolution and to provide notice indicating its intent to raise funds through a replenishment assessment for groundwater replenishment purposes and for groundwater replenishment and water quality projects and programs in the ensuing year. Attached is a copy of the above referenced Resolution No. 03-666.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

None with this action.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the Board receive and file the 2003 Engineering Survey and Report, and adopt Resolution No. 03-666.
RESOLUTION NO. 03- 666

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE WATER
REPLENISHMENT DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ORDERING ACCEPTANCE AND FILING OF THE ENGINEERING
SURVEY AND REPORT SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO SECTIONS
60300 AND 60301 OF THE WATER CODE, DECLARING THAT FUNDS
SHALL BE RAISED FOR THE PURCHASE OF WATER FOR
REPLENISHMENT AND FOR GROUNDWATER REPLENISHMENT
AND QUALITY PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS DURING THE ENSUING
FISCAL YEAR, THAT SUCH FUNDS SHALL BE RAISED BY A
REPLENISHMENT ASSESSMENT AS PROVIDED IN SAID WATER
CODE, DECLARING THAT THE FUNDS TO BE RAISED BY SAID
REPLENISHMENT ASSESSMENT WILL BENEFIT, EITHER DIRECTLY
OR INDIRECTLY, ALL OF THE PERSONS, REAL PROPERTY AND/OR
IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE DISTRICT, AND ORDERING THE
PUBLICATION OF A NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING IN ACCORDANCE
WITH SECTION 60306 OF THE WATER CODE

WHEREAS, there has been submitted to the Secretary of the Water
Replenishment District of Southern California ("District") the engineering survey
and report heretofore ordered pursuant to Sections 60300 and 60301 of the
California Water Code; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the District ("Board") has received
said report;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AND DECLARED:
(1) That the said engineering survey and report be received and filed in
the records of the District;

(2) That funds shall be raised to purchase water for replenishment of the
groundwater supplies within the District during the next ensuring fiscal
year of the District, and to accomplish all acts reasonably necessary to
said replenishment, including but not limited to the development and
operation of capital projects, and that such funds shall be raised by a replenishment assessment, as provided in California Water Code Sections 60300 et seq;

(3) That funds shall be raised to remove contaminants from groundwater supplies and to exercise any other power under California Water Code Section 60224, including but not limited to developing and operating capital projects, and that such funds shall be raised by a replenishment assessment as provided by California Water Code Section 60300 et seq;

(4) That funds shall be raised to pay for the District’s operating and administrative expenses, and such funds shall be raised by a replenishment assessment pursuant to California Water Code Section 60300 et seq;

(5) A public hearing shall be held by the second Tuesday in April 2003 for the purpose of determining whether and to what extent the estimated cost of the actions described in paragraphs 2, 3, and 4, above for the ensuing fiscal year shall be paid for by a replenishment assessment;

(6) That the funds so raised to accomplish the actions described in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, above during the next ensuing fiscal year will benefit, directly or indirectly, all of the persons and/or real property and improvements within the District;

(7) That the General Manager of the District shall cause to be published on behalf of the Board a notice that a public hearing will be held for the purposes described in paragraph 5, above. Such notice shall be published once in the Metropolitan News, an adjudicated paper of general circulation in Los Angeles County, at least ten (10) days before
said hearing. Such notice shall contain a copy of said Board’s resolution, the time and place of said hearing, and an invitation to all interested parties to attend and be heard in support of or in opposition to said proposed assessment, and shall invite inspection of the engineering survey and report upon which the Board acted.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 3rd day of March 2003.

__________________________
President

ATTEST:

__________________________
Secretary
DATE: MARCH 3, 2003
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: BRUCE A. MOWRY, GENERAL MANAGER
SUBJECT: MEMORANDUM CONCERNING COOPERATIVE UNDERTAKINGS BETWEEN THE WATER REPLENISHMENT DISTRICT AND WEST BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT

To be discussed.

FISCAL IMPACT
Unknown.

RECOMMENDATION: For discussion and possible adoption.
AGENDA ITEM NO. IX

DATE: MARCH 3, 2003
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: BRUCE A. MOWRY, GENERAL MANAGER
SUBJECT: WEST BASIN RECYCLED WATER PURCHASE AGREEMENT

To be discussed.

FISCAL IMPACT
Unknown.

RECOMMENDATION: For discussion and possible adoption.
Staff will provide a legislative update.

**FISCAL IMPACT**
None.

**RECOMMENDATION:** For information.