

## **ODOR CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD**

Bahai Center  
5750 Rodeo Road  
February 2nd, 2004

### **MEETING #19 MINUTES**

Attendees: See attached attendance list

Meeting Minutes Recorded by: Ahmad Ghanem, City of Los Angeles

Handouts:

1. Copy of Mr. Bowker's presentation
2. Copy of written comments prepared by Mr. Samuel Hart

#### **Introductory Issues:**

Mr. Ted Lumpkin chaired the meeting. The meeting agenda was approved. The minutes of previous meeting were approved.

#### **Independent Odor Review: Final Draft report by Mr. Bowker**

Mr. Bowker of Bowker & Associates, Inc. appeared before the Odor Advisory Board and presented his Final Draft report. The Final Draft included an approach study, conclusion, and recommendations of his findings concerning the City sewer odor issues. The presentation was followed by series of questions and open discussions.

#### **Review Comments**

Mr. Samuel Hart handed out his written comments and was responded by Mr. Bowker as follows:

*Refer to page iii, item 3.*

*Change the quantity and description of hot spots to agree with par. 3.3 and Figure 6 on pages 21, 2, and 23 of the report.*

Bowker will make the change.

*Refer to page vi, item 8.*

*The Odor Advisory Board should also prepare a report that provides a summary of the advice/accomplishments.*

Bowker agreed.

*Refer to page 7, item 2.3.2.*

*Since sealing of maintenance holes does little more than move the problem to a different location, it is recommended that it be a discontinued practice for odor solutions.*

Bowker stated that sealing of maintenance holes remains somewhat effective though it might shift the odor from one place to another. Brent Lorscheider added that effectiveness of the practice of sealing maintenance hole need to take into account other factors such as the operation of the Air Treatment Facilities. The sealant program might be needed to keep

the air pressure in the collection system and route them to the designated area to be extracted by the ATF.

*Refer to page 27, item 3.4.2.*

*Change Rodeo and Coliseum to Rodeo and La Cienega.*

Bowker will make the change.

*Refer to pages 40, 41, and 42, item 5.3*

*The outline for the Master Plan covers little more than the data that is already provided in this report. If the plan is intended to be used as a management tool, then the key topics are missing and the following topics (as a minimum) are recommended for inclusion:*

- *Purpose*
- *Task descriptions*
- *Design Criteria*
- *Goals/Objectives*
- *Milestone schedule*
- *Management Strategy*
- *Accountability*
- *Verification Strategy*

Bowker agreed and noted that what is missing from the Odor Master Plan outline is an objective or goal, also a measure of success.

Victor Nahmias requested to identify the Odor “Hot Spots” map on page 22 to make it easy to follow. Bowker agreed to make the change.

Ted referred to page 30, Figure 7 and asked about the location of chemical addition. Bowker pointed out the location.

Ted also commended Mr. Bowker for doing a good job on his Final Draft report and for writing the report in a way that easy to understand. The board concurred with Ted’s commendation.

**Questions, Answers and Action Items:**

	<b>Questions /Issues</b>	<b>Comments/Responses</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
1	Bowker’s Final Draft Report	Hyginus asked whether the detention time was calculated.	Bowker responded that he did not calculate the detention time but estimated at a typical velocity of 2 feet per second (fps), it would be over 24 hours.
		Ted asked about the old sewer velocity design criteria of 2 fps and the newly adopted 3 fps.	Bowker stated that these velocities are minimum design criteria, and steeper slope dictates the velocity.

		Victor asked: How do you change the sewer system from 2 fps to 3 fps.	Bowker clarified that only the new sewer would be built based on the new criteria. The already built sewer would still have to run under the 2 fps criteria.
		Victor asked about the design capacity criteria of ECIS and why the NOS was designed for 75% full.	Bowker stated that he believed it was designed 50% full and added that the old criteria of 75% full were still widely used throughout the industry.
		Hyginus stated that there are many rehab projects going on and it may reduce the capacity of the sewer, which in turn may increase the odor in the area. He asked that whether Bowker had looked into this issue.	Bowker responded that the analysis on the impact of sewer being rehabilitated was not discussed in his report.
		Victor asked about the Siphons/Air Jumpers and whether the City under-designed them.	Bowker stated that siphon is a universal problems. The City used an empirical formula for air jumper design.
		Ted asked about the chemical addition and whether one location is sufficient to treat the system.	Bowker responded that the City is looking into a second location. He added that chemical addition only makes odor less intense and it's about 90% effective. Economically, chemical can never be added enough to be 100% effective.
		Ms. Kathleen Salvaty asked if the 7 proposed ATF's are properly located. She also noted that on page 18, tables 3, the number of complaints are not consistent from year to year.	Bowker said that for the locations that they are intended to treat, it would work. The proposed ATFs will greatly reduce the foul odor, beside the chemical treatment that reduces the bacteria that generates the H2S gas, and in addition to ECIS project, all that should reduce the sewer odor to a great extent and tolerant level.
		Carol stated that she was concerned about whether the City's odor control program would work or not and that the report should state that there is no solution for certain areas.	Bowker responded by saying that he believed the technology would work. He was not sure whether all of the problems will be solved after the ATFs because the unknowns are not available yet for the S. Maze area. Debbie added that once the ATFs are in place, the unknowns would be available. Should it be necessary, test/sample will be performed and solution will be proposed to address the issue as part of the Odor Master Plan.

		Hyginus requested that knowing the odor issue, Bowker should provide his recommendation for the temporary solutions in his report.	Brent responded that the City did have the temporary solution such as putting the carbon scrubbers at the traffic island. It's only months away from the completion of ECIS with the temporary scrubber in place and it would be best to wait to have a complete understanding on how the system responds.
		Ted asked about the impact of the increase population on the sewer odor.	Brent replied that the increase in population not only impacts the odor but also has its impacts on many other areas such as transportation, pollution, etc.
2	Frequency of Advisory Board meetings	<p>Carol raised the question whether to expand the Advisory Board to cover all of the City areas, or form regional boards.</p> <p>Ted suggested discussing the future of the Board at the next meeting after receiving the final report from Mr. Bowker.</p>	<p>The general sentiment is to have regional boards in different areas of the City.</p> <p>All attending members agree with that notion.</p>

## Future Agenda

### Odor Advisory Board Summary Report Frequency of future board meetings.

The next meeting will be on April 5th, 2004 chaired by Mrs. Carol Tucker.