TETRA TECH

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

May 4, 2011

TO: Mr. Andre Dupret
City of Maywood
4319 Slauson Avenue
Maywood, California 90270

SUBJECT: **Response to Public Comments from the March 5, 2011 Public Hearing on the Results of Maywood Water Quality Assessment**
City of Maywood, Los Angeles County, California

ENCLOSED PLEASE FIND:

- Maywood Mutual Water Company #1, #2, and #3's written response to comments from the March 5, 2011 public hearing on the results of Maywood Water Quality Assessment.

If you have any questions or require additional information please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (949)809-5000.

Sincerely,
Tetra Tech GEO

Don Lee, PG, CHG
Senior Hydrogeologist

cc: Mr. Sergio Palos, Maywood Mutual Water Company #1
Mr. Gustavo Villa, Maywood Mutual Water Company #2
Mr. Bob Rohlf, Maywood Mutual Water Company #3

TETRA TECH GEO
17885 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 500, Irvine, CA 92614
Tel 949.809.5000 Fax 949.809.5010 www.tetratechgeo.com www.tetratech.com

AB 890 Water Quality Assessment Report
Public Hearing – March 5, 2011

PUBLIC TESTIMONY – EXTRACTS OF COURT REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPTS

RESPONSE by Maywood Mutual Water Company #1, Maywood Mutual Water Company #2, and Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 are in BLUE colored text

SPEAKER	ADDRESS	COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
1. Hector Alvarado	4302 E. Slauson Ave. Maywood, CA	No relevant comments on the Report made.
2. Agustin Cevada	3570 E. Slauson Ave. Maywood, CA	A. Wants to know why after 2009, no more Perchlorate was found in the water. B. Will cancer screening be conducted in the affected areas and will the water companies be paying for it?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 - Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report includes perchlorate data collected through to end of 2009. Perchlorate was never a problem. No perchlorate results were reported to be above the Primary Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs). When perchlorate was detected more frequent testing was carried out. Perchlorate was detected once, but not detected in more than 12 subsequent tests in 2009. Cancer screening or health risk assessment was not part of this study or AB890.

Maywood Mutual Water Companies #1 and #2 - Perchlorate was not detected in our water.

3. Eugenio Villa	5515 Gifford Ave. Maywood, CA	A. Why should the rest of California have a standard for clean water which is lower than that for Maywood? B. If Maywood's standard is raised, what will that do to the cost of water in Maywood and to the businesses that consume that water?

RESPONSE: These questions were directed to California State Assembly Speaker, John Perez.

4. Jader Gonzalez	4440 54th St. Maywood, CA	A. Are the water companies mixing un-contaminated water from one well with water in a well that is not so contaminated?

RESPONSE: None of the water is "contaminated." However, water from a well with higher manganese concentration is blended with water from a well with lower manganese concentration

to ensure that drinking water standards are continuously attained in the delivered water. Water blending is a practice accepted by the California Department of Public Health.

B. What will be done to lower the level of contamination in the water?

RESPONSE: Some of the options that can be considered for improving water quality include water blending, water treatment, and purchasing Central Basin Municipal Water District (imported) water at higher prices.

5.	Robert Taylor	5934 King Ave. Maywood, CA	When will the water companies fix the water contamination problem?

RESPONSE: The problem is being worked every day and will continue to be worked on.

Maywood Mutual Water Companies #1 - There is no "contamination" in the water that we are serving our customers. Our water is continuously tested by government agencies and it passes all of their tests.

6.	Desiderio Vallez	4047 57th St. Maywood, CA	No relevant comments on the Report made.
7.	Jesus Araparilla	4125 E. 53rd St. Maywood, CA	A. What is meant by "well profiling?"

RESPONSE: Well profiling is a test performed inside an existing water well to determine the amount of water flow and water quality at different depths within a well.

B. How much would it cost to investigate a well and how long would it take?

RESPONSE: Well profiling may cost approximately from $25,000 to $50,000 and may take two to three months to complete depending on various factors.

C. On April 10, 2009 Water Company No. 1 received a letter from DPH that well number 4 was seeing high levels of manganese. Did Water Company No. 2 receive a similar letter? If so, what requirements were imposed on Water Company No. 2 to reduce manganese levels in the water?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 - Yes, Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 received a letter from California Department of Public Health (CDPH) regarding high manganese levels and was forced to sign a compromising letter with CDPH in 2007/2008 to install a treatment plant to alleviate the manganese levels in the 52nd Street pump site. Subsequently, we never received citations regarding these issues.

D. How can higher fees that residents pay for water through Water company No. 2 be justified when the filtration system is not in operation now? We've been paying for this system almost eleven or twelve months.

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 - The cost of the oxidation and filtration system has not been included in the bill to date.

8. Maribel Lopez 4051 E. 53rd St.
Maywood, CA

A. I noticed in the Report that you took more samples from areas in Water Company #1 and #3 in contrast to fewer samples from Water Company #2 areas, therefore, you did less testing on #1 and #3 than #2 knowing that #3 had high levels of perchlorate. Why?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 – Additional manganese tests were conducted to be able to operate and monitor blending operations.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 - The sampling frequency is determined by what is found while testing. When perchlorate was detected more frequent testing was carried out. Perchlorate was never a problem. Perchlorate was detected once, but not detected in more than 12 subsequent tests in 2009. No perchlorate was detected above the Primary Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs).

B. I read in the Report that it is costly in the near and long term but you do not show us an amount (cost). Why?

RESPONSE: Estimated costs were provided to give an idea of what the costs would be. Quotes will be obtained for all work need to be done before the contract is issued. Furthermore, to the extent that the solution is purchasing more water then it becomes very difficult to predict pricing because the price is set by the company that we purchase our water from.

C. I also noticed that Water Company #1 purchased water from Central Basin but not Water Company #2. What is the cost of buying water from Central Basin?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Companies #1 and #2 – Central Basin Municipal Water District (imported water) charges approximately $855 to $980 per acre-foot (325,851 gallons) depending on water usage, plus a fee of over $500 per month. Cost of imported water is

approximately 2.5 to 4 times higher than the local groundwater, depending on water usage and other costs.
Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 -The cost of buying Central Basin Municipal Water District (imported) water is approximately $900.00 per acre-foot of water or 435.6 units of water without operation costs. The cost of imported water is approximately 2.5 to 4 times higher than the local groundwater, depending on water usage and other costs.

D. As you mix water from these different wells, will the result be that there will be no more contaminants, or will we just decrease the level?

RESPONSE: Water blending is conducted to reduce the contaminant levels and ensure that drinking water standards are continuously attained in the delivered water. Water blending is a practice accepted by the California Department of Public Health.

E. At some point will we be able to change the pipes?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 – Yes, water pipe replacement is part of our long term plan and will be changed when the opportunity presents itself.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 -Water pipelines will be changed as needed to keep costs as low as possible for the users.

9. Luis Arizando 4809 Gifford Ave. Maywood, CA

A. How much of the treated water going through our pipes is truly clean?

RESPONSE: The water coming from the treatment plants will meet the drinking water standards.

B. Are the pipes clean?

RESPONSE: Cleaning the pipes is an ongoing maintenance that is worked on all year long.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 – Depending on the pipe material. Cast iron pipes are prone to rust corrosion inside the pipe, ductile iron pipes have a concrete type coating on the inside of the pipe to help prevent rust corrosion. Regardless of the type of pipe, rust, manganese and other sediments will accumulate, fall and lay on to the bottom of any of these pipes. Flushing removes the loose sediment from these pipes and is an important part of water system maintenance.

C. Isn't it illegal to sell products that are contaminated?

RESPONSE: There are no contaminated product being sold, all drinking water provided meets state standards for drinking water.

10. Portillo Lopez — 4051 53rd St. Maywood, CA — When is the water problem going to be fixed?

RESPONSE: Water quality improvement is being worked on every day. Water quality data indicate that currently Maywood's water quality meets the state drinking water standards.

11. Ms. S. Martinez — 4851 58th St. Maywood, CA — I work with a collaborative of neighboring cities in partnership with District 7, City officials, and State agencies such as the EPA. My comments on the Report are:

A. The Report does not address anything regarding the delivery system. Why?

RESPONSE: This was not a part of AB 890. Water companies are aware of the issues related to old pipes and the maintenance is ongoing.

B. Regarding Water Company #2, I'm having a hard time understanding your long-term plan about piping, creating a pipeline from one well to the other, and funding and getting loans.

RESPONSE: Statement not a question

C. Will the water companies come to the table to discuss funding with the community before any decisions on funding are made?

RESPONSE: Decisions will be made to keep water within the state standards.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 – The company's board of directors generally keeps our shareholders aware of major financial decisions.

D. AB 890 specifically states that no resident should have an increase for any protrusion, water or anything to do with filtration. We're asking for a breakdown of all charges being billed.

RESPONSE: AB 890 does not state who should bear the burden of costs.

12. Rosa Almeda — 4018 E. 58th St. Maywood, CA — No relevant comments on the Report made.

13. Ediberto Blanca — 3526 56th St. Maywood, CA — They say they're going to decrease all the contaminants by putting good water into bad water. The bad water will still be there. All

you're doing is bleaching it. How long must we wait for clean water?

RESPONSE: Water blending is only a way to meet state drinking water standards while other solutions are being looked into. Water blending is a practice accepted by the California Department of Public Health.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 – We are blending, not bleaching, to meet the state manganese Secondary MCL (aesthetic) levels at the distribution system. Our goal is to obtain a government grant funding or raise funds within the community for a treatment plant to remove manganese from our well #4 to Non Detect levels. We have a pending State Grant funding for a treatment plant, which may be awarded by June 2011.

14. Cynthia Babbage	Director of the Del Amo Action Committee	**Note: Please see Ms. Babbage's written comments which were submitted under separate cover.**
15. Edna Peralta	5956 Gifford St. Maywood, CA	The Report is not complete because it only focuses on certain chemicals such as TCE in Water Company #3 and manganese in Water Companies #1 and #3.

RESPONSE: Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report is required to identify and address only the chemicals of concern for each water source. Other chemicals are listed in the Consumer Confidence Reports for each water company. Copies of the Consumer Confidence Reports are available from Maywood mutual water companies and California Department of Public Health.

A. I would like future reports to have analysis of all the chemicals in the water.

RESPONSE: Results of analysis of all the chemicals in the water for each water company are summarized in Consumer Confidence Report available from Maywood mutual water companies and California Department of Public Health.

B. Use terminology in future reports that residents can understand and make reports accessible in Spanish.

RESPONSE: The Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report was translated into Spanish by all three water companies.

C. When water is flushed, does the system work or is water simply dumped?

RESPONSE: Flushing helps remove rust and contaminants from the water mains, and is part of the California Department of Public Health requirements.

16. Lucia Varela	4634 E. 58th St.	**Note: Please see Ms. Varela's written**

	Maywood, CA	**comments which were submitted under separate cover.**
17. Ruben Guardado	5125 E. 60th Pl. Maywood, CA	I do not agree with the solution(s) that the water companies present in the Report regarding contaminated water, such as mixing water from different tanks in order to decrease levels of contaminants. I would like the mixing of water to stop.

A. The Report should state that, though the water companies are cleaning up the water, the pipes that carry the water are contaminating it.

RESPONSE: Statement not a question

B. Another solution to consider is bringing uncontaminated water from other wells. Why do you have to mix contaminated water with good water?

RESPONSE: Other wells cannot supply the needed water system demands for the community. Central Basin Municipal Water District (imported) water may be available but at a much higher cost. Water blending is a practice accepted by the California Department of Public Health that can provide water that is low cost and meets the state drinking water standards.

18. Marisa Graciola	4043 E. 51st St. Maywood, CA	No relevant comments on the Report made.
19. Kenya Caser	3622 Slauson Ave. Maywood, CA	A. Why is there more testing in Water Company #1 than in the other companies?

RESPONSE: Testing is being done for different purposes, water blending for one.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 – It is the management choice to do extra testing. This help us to track our blending plan and monitor the manganese level at the water distribution system and be able to adjust to any changes in manganese levels in a timely manner.

B. How efficient is the flushing system?

RESPONSE: System flushing can be very efficient if done properly.

C. There is a water scarcity. Why are we dumping so much water?

RESPONSE: System flushing is a part of operation required by the California Department of Public Health.

D. What will happen to the manganese once water well pipes are changed?

RESPONSE: Well pipes are not being changed. Water treatment or blending will lower or remove manganese levels in the water, which may facilitate cleaning of the water mains.

E. How are pipes going to be cleaned?

RESPONSE: Water mains are cleaned by flushing.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 – We monitor for water quality and flush when needed. Pigging water mains is another option but more costly.

F. How long will manganese last after intervention is completed?

RESPONSE: It has been reported that old iron and galvanized residential lines cause rusty or yellowish water, but discoloration does not necessarily indicate presence of manganese. If the water delivered has lower manganese concentrations, water quality will generally improve over time, but rust problem may persist particularly where old galvanized residential lines exist. Rust is removed by flushing. Determining the quality of water in the residential lines was not part of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report or AB890. However, if the data exists they can be reviewed to determine whether it is a potential problem.

G. How do you balance the health risk with the cost to resolve the problem?

RESPONSE: Balancing health risk is never a part of our operation. We believe that health is more important than anything else, and we are monitoring the water quality to deliver water that meets the state drinking water standards. Our water quality is monitored by California Department of Public Health.

H. What results do you have of other water contaminants? Why did you not test the TCE perchlorate of Water Company #1 and #2.

RESPONSE: All Maywood water companies' wells are tested for perchlorate and TCE. The test results are provided in the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) for each water company.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 – The Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) requires you to report only those drinking water chemicals and constituents that have been detected. In the CCR, if there was a violation of any maximum contaminant level (MCL) or regulatory action level (AL), you must mark the results with an asterisk (*) and provide a detailed explanation of

the violation that occurred. The deadline for distributing the CCR to your consumers is July of each year.

20. Sandra Orozco	4108 54th St. Maywood, CA	What is the purpose of AB 890? Help me better understand AB 890 and why was it drafted?

RESPONSE: These questions were directed to California State Assembly Speaker, John Perez.

21. Miriam Torres	Program Director Environmental Justice Coalition for Water	The long-term and short-term options for the most part are poorly prepared. There are no timelines, benchmarks or any statements that give the community a sense that they are seriously being considered. There is no indication that the community has investigated these options or obtained a number of estimates to assess the economic impacts of the options. The Report can be improved by adding a table of terms, explaining terms like ug/1, acre-feet, and all other technical information not explained.

A. How often are the water companies conducting other water tests in addition to the WRD schedule?

RESPONSE: Weekly, monthly, quarterly, yearly or when required.

B. In regards to the short-term proposals:
   a. What is the additional cost?

RESPONSE: Varies depending on the short term process being utilized. For the blending option the additional cost depends on the amount of additional water needed to be purchased to blend with well water.

   b. What would be the impact on the consumer?

RESPONSE: Impact on the consumer is unknown until we decide exactly what will be done and have a plan in place. All of the companies are looking for a solution that will allow them to meet AB 890's mandates while keeping any rate increase to their customers to a minimum.

   c. Does your plan include cost estimates?

RESPONSE: Yes, we have cost estimates but we will get actual quotes after a decision has been reached on what plan is selected. Until the companies can determine the amount of any potential grant(s) and/or zero interest loan(s) that maybe available to them, they can not estimate the amount of money that they will have to pay from their general fund.

C. In regards to the long-term proposals:
   a. Are you going to buy more water to blend? From where?

RESPONSE: Possibly if needed, more water may be purchased from Central Basin Municipal Water District

   b. When are the results of the studies going to be ready?

RESPONSE: AB 890 Report is already complete. Compliance water test results are compiled by WRD and will be presented in Consumer Confidence Report.

   c. What steps are you going to take to see if installing a replacement well is possible? Out of all the options what is the best one?
   d. The least expensive?

RESPONSE: Wells will be dealt with on an individual basis depending on what can be done to correct problems as the need arises. The least expensive option will likely be selected. The first step is to determine the amount of any potential grant(s) and/or zero interest loan(s).

   e. What other steps are you taking to raise funds?

RESPONSE: Other steps to raise the funds include applying for grant(s) and/or zero interest loans. The last alternative is to increase rates.

D. Questions for Maywood Mutual Water Company #2:
   a. How many residents are served in total?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 serves approximately 6,700 residents.

   b. What are your groundwater rights?

RESPONSE: 912 acre-feet

   c. What long-term option has been seriously considered and investigated?

RESPONSE: Oxidation and filtration system plant for treating manganese

d. What entity provided the estimate of 1-1.5 million dollars?

RESPONSE: Tetra Tech GEO (formerly GeoTrans, Inc.) provided a cost estimate of $1 million to $1.5 million to pipe from Maywood Avenue Well to 52nd Street Well.

e. What alternatives have you considered?

RESPONSE: Alternatives considered include blending, variance, and purchasing water from Central Basin Municipal Water District

f. What have other companies done?

RESPONSE: They likely have done the same types of things.

E. Questions for Maywood Mutual Water Company #3:
   a. What do you mean exactly when stating that production in Prospect well was reduced?

RESPONSE: Production in Prospect Well was reduced means less water was used from that well.

In regards to short-term options:

b. What are the plans for well #7 that also has high levels of TCE?

RESPONSE: The plans for Well #7 is continue testing to make sure the average of 6 months does not exceed the MCL.

c. What is the protocol for perchlorate?

RESPONSE: The protocol for perchlorate is test monthly if detected.

d. How many times do you have to re-test when perchlorate is found?

RESPONSE: If perchlorate is detected, test until Non Detect for over a year.

e. Which of your long-term options have been seriously investigated? What is most appropriate and best for the community? What plans do you have to implement these options? What is your timeline? How many estimates have you received?

RESPONSE: All long term options have been investigated. The most appropriate and best for the community would be an option that has low costs, while meeting state standards. At present water quality standards are being met. We will work on this day to day. There is not a specific timeline it is a day to day effort. Only one cost estimate was received at present. When a decision is made to move on an option, bids will be obtained to keep the cost down.

f. Who is collecting the water samples for perchlorate?

RESPONSE: Test America Laboratories collected water samples for Water Replenishment District of Southern California.

22. Mr. Sal. Contreras 4867 61st St. Maywood, CA — There is no provision in AB 890 for money. Where is Mr. Perez going to get it?

RESPONSE: These questions were directed to California State Assembly Speaker, John Perez

23. Jose Valenzuela 54th St. Maywood, CA — Who will pay for the AB 890 bill? The water companies? Will rates increase?

RESPONSE: Water companies paid for the AB 890 Report. Rates will likely increase, depending on the amount of grant(s) and/or zero interest loans that are made available to the companies.

24. Hector Alvarado 4302 E. Slauson Ave. Maywood, CA

A. Are the water companies in Maywood private?

RESPONSE: The Maywood water companies are private, not-for-profit corporations that provide water, at cost, to their shareholders. Revenue generated goes back into the water company for daily expenses, maintenance, or upgrades to the water system.

B. The report by Water Company #2 was done in 2009. Is it the same report that they are using now?

RESPONSE: The 2009 Consumer Confidence Report contained the most recent data at the time of the Report.

C. How many people does Water Company

#2 serve?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 serves approximately 6,700 residents.

D. What rights does Water Company #2 have for groundwater?

RESPONSE: 912 acre-feet

E. Why doesn't Water Company #2 take samples of TCE and perchlorate?

RESPONSE: All Maywood water companies' wells are tested for perchlorate and TCE. The test results are provided in the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) for each water company.

F. What is the estimate that the Report gives us based on, and what other estimates do you have?

RESPONSE: The cost estimate of $1 million to $1.5 million for pipeline provided in the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report is a preliminary estimate based on typical engineering and construction costs, not an actual quote. If an option is selected, several quotes will be obtained to keep the cost down. No other cost estimates have been obtained.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 - Manganese treatment plant cost estimate is based on estimates received from 3 vendors. Once we are able to issue a purchase order a final price will asked from each vendor. A scope of work, insurances, timeline of the work, all permits needed and guarantees must be submitted before selecting a vendor.

G. What results are there for other contaminants such as TCE, perchlorate and organic materials?

RESPONSE: All Maywood water companies' wells are tested for possible contaminants including perchlorate, TCE, and other constituents required for regulatory compliance. The test results are provided in the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) for each water company.

H. What are your plans to better the pipes and how much will it cost to replace them?

RESPONSE: Maywood water companies' plan is to continue flushing the water mains to help remove rust and contaminants from the water mains, as part of the California Department of Public Health requirements. Water main replacement cost will be very high (approximately $1 million per mile).

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 – For a long term plan, pipe replacement within 20 - 30 years or whenever opportunity presents itself, for example, broken pipe or new development in our service area.

Water Company #3:

I. Where does the pollution come from?

RESPONSE: Investigating the source of TCE or perchlorate is not within the scope of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report or AB 890. The California Department of Public Health and EPA conducted studies and were unable to determine the source of TCE. Perchlorate is not a problem. Perchlorate was only detected once and it was non detect in more than a dozen tests taken monthly in 2009 and 2010.

J. What are you doing in regards to the contamination of TCE?

RESPONSE: Testing and making sure that the levels remain below the MCL average for a 6 month period.

K. What are you doing to resolve the source of perchlorate?

RESPONSE: Perchlorate is not a problem. Perchlorate was only detected once and it was non detect in more than a dozen tests taken monthly in 2009 and 2010.

L. What are you doing about the taste and smell of chlorine?

RESPONSE: Chlorine is used to disinfect the water, some people are more sensitive to the smell but the levels of chlorine are kept below 1.0 parts per billion (ppb), while on wells and 2.5 ppb while on Metropolitan (imported) water. The legal limit for chlorine is 4.0 ppb.

AB 890 Water Quality Assessment Report
Public Hearing – March 5, 2011

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
EXTRACTS OF COURT REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPTS

Note: Public Testimony (Comments/Questions) Were Submitted Under Separate Cover

RESPONSE by Maywood Mutual Water Company #1, Maywood Mutual Water Company #2, and Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 are in BLUE colored text

COUNCILMEMBER	COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
1. Felipe Aguirre	A. The Report is missing a lot of information in terms of a specific time plan and a cost benefit analysis. Why? RESPONSE: Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report (the Report) addressed all items requested in the AB 890. AB 890 does not call for specific time plan or cost-benefit analysis. We would have gladly addressed additional questions or concerns if the City of Maywood or other community groups have forwarded the questions or concerns to us before the Report was submitted. B. It is up to the water companies to respond to questions that the people have asked regarding the Report and to develop a solution to the issues talked about today. RESPONSE: Comment noted. The water companies have addressed the questions in these response documents, and the water companies are open to further discussions regarding the study findings and developing solutions.
2. Veronica Guardado	A. The Report states that if Water Company #2 turns the plant on, the manganese level would be less than 40. But a comment was made that it was going to be less – up to zero. There seems to be a conflict or contradiction. What's correct, the Report or the explanation from the member from Water Company #2? RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 - The treated water from the treatment plant would have nearly zero micrograms per liter (ug/L) or parts per billion manganese concentration. If the water is blended with water from other Maywood #2 well, the manganese concentration in the blended water would be less than 40 ug/L.

B. Comments have been made about the flushing and that it is to clear out items or contaminants from the water. Who's paying for the flushing? Is the water company shouldering the cost, or is that cost being passed on to the community being served by Water Company #2?

RESPONSE: Flushing helps remove rust and contaminants from the water mains, and is California Department of Public Health's basic operational requirement for all public water systems. Cost of flushing is a part of required operational costs, and therefore, the cost is shared by the users.

C. There is an inconsistency in the Report in the number of samples taken by all water companies. Water Company #3 states in the Report that there was perchlorate found once. However, there were only four samples taken from that well for a period of one year. To alleviate the concern of perchlorate, shouldn't more samples have been taken on that particular well or all wells?

RESPONSE: The sampling frequency for each water source may differ depending on regulatory agency testing frequency and testing results. Also additional sampling may be conducted by each water company.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 - More than a dozen perchlorate samples, not only four, were collected in 2009 (See Appendix B in the Report). The four samples were collected by Test America Laboratories for Title 22 requirements for Water Replenishment District of Southern California.

D. The Report is very incomplete. It doesn't have a plan to resolve issues, it only talks about creating new wells or blending. It doesn't look at the infrastructure of the pipes between the water companies and the homes.

RESPONSE: Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report addressed all items requested in the AB 890, including short and long term options for resolving the manganese issue by blending and/or constructing a treatment plant. AB 890 did not require looking at the pipes because the manganese in the water is coming from the wells and not the infrastructure. We would have gladly addressed any other question or concern if the City of Maywood or other community groups have forwarded the questions or concerns to us before the Report was submitted.

E. With regards to funding, where is the money going to come

from and who is going to pay for all this?

RESPONSE: The sources of funding for the improvements include government grants, zero interest loans, and the companys' general funds. AB 890 does not state where the money for the lower manganese water should come from. Cost of the improvements can be reduced by government grants that can sufficiently reduce capital costs and by low interest or subsidized loans that can spread out the costs over many years to make the water more affordable.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 - Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 has asked the City of Maywood for a letter of support to secure a grant from the State of California for the construction of a manganese filtration treatment plant at Well #4. If the grant is not funded, the water company plans to continue blending until the board of directors and management can find a way to raise the needed capital at the best possible rate. If a note is taken out for water system infrastructure, the water company will have to pass the cost on to the consumer.

F. The Report states that 110 purveyors were surveyed within the 20-mile radius. Of the those surveyed, only three were greater than ten micrograms per liter of magnesium, four were greater than 20, and in some places in our City we are up to 60. Why did the Bill only state that ours had to have lower than 13.7?

RESPONSE: AB 890 states that Maywood water companies conduct a study to determine the *average* manganese concentration in surrounding communities and determine what steps can be taken to reduce the manganese concentration to that level. AB 890 does not state that the Maywood water had to have manganese concentration lower than the average manganese concentration in surrounding communities nor does it require any specific manganese level.

3. Mayor Varela

A. Did the Report preparer receive any documents from the mutual water companies operating in Maywood which state that they purchased other water from different water mutuals or water districts? If so, can you list them?

RESPONSE: Sources of purchased water are included in the Report.

B. Was the Report preparer given equal amount of information from each mutual water company to complete this Report? If not, can you list each mutual water company's information that was given?

RESPONSE: Generally equal amount of information was provided by each mutual water company. Pertinent information provided by each mutual water company is included in the Report.

C. Why is Mutual Water Company #3 using 2008 sampling results?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 - Maywood Mutual Water Company #3's 2008 sampling results were used in addition to 2009 results to provide additional data. For example, no manganese results were available for 2009. Manganese is not a problem in Maywood Mutual Water Company #3's wells.

D. If the production of water is less but the concentration of manganese is high, does it make that well more contaminated than others?

RESPONSE: No, assuming static conditions the concentration in a well remains the same, regardless of the amount of water used.

E. All your blending plan causes is to use more water to dilute the contaminant level to meet AB 890. In today's presentation, the amount to meet AB 890 is not even close. So, is blending the solution?

RESPONSE: Blending can provide water that meets the state drinking water standards. Blending also can meet the AB 890 levels in some cases. Details are provided in the Report.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 - Blending is being conducted at Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 and provides water that meets the current California Department of Public Health drinking water standards for manganese (50 ug/L). A long term solution of manganese removal plant will cost well over a million dollars to implement. Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 has a government grant pending. If the grant is not funded, management will have to investigate other alternatives to raise the capital to pay for the treatment plant.

F. The long-term approach is to pipe some 6,000 linear feet. Why not just put a new manganese plant on the Maywood Avenue well and it would cost the same? Why would you just report back on the blending for short term?

RESPONSE: Another oxidation and filtration plant is an option but would have a greater cost, and additional operating costs. Blending is an option for lowering the manganese concentration to or below 40 ug/L, which meets the state drinking water standards.

Significantly more blending with purchased water, instead of well water (and the resulting higher cost), would be required to meet the AB 890 level.

G. Other contaminants that are listed as primary standards and secondary standards are not present or listed in Appendix B. Why?

RESPONSE: Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report is required to identify and address only the chemicals of concern for each water source. Other chemicals were not listed in Appendix B because these chemicals were not detected or did not exceed any state drinking water standards (primary or secondary MCLs). Other chemicals are listed in the Consumer Confidence Reports for each water company. Copies of the Consumer Confidence Reports are available from Maywood mutual water companies and California Department of Public Health.

H. The report does not meet the requirements set forth in AB 890. Will more information be provided on meeting the AB 890 requirements and goals and how they will be obtained?

RESPONSE: The slide presentation provided at the public hearing was a brief overview, not the complete report. The Report meets the requirements of AB 890. Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report addressed all 5 study objectives (see Page 2 in the Report) set forth in AB 890.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 - We would have gladly addressed any other question or concern if the City of Maywood or other community groups have forwarded the questions or concerns to us before the Report was submitted.

AB 890 Water Quality Assessment Report
Public Hearing – March 5, 2011

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

QUESTIONS from Mr. Hector Alvarado, March 5, 2011

RESPONSE by Maywood Mutual Water Company #1, Maywood Mutual Water Company #2, and Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 are in BLUE colored text

---

1 General Questions

1.1 What does the Manganese percentage refer to?

RESPONSE: If the question is referring to manganese standard reported in the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report, the manganese standard referenced in the Report is the Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels (SMCL) of 50 micrograms per liter (ug/L) or parts per billion (ppb) aesthetic water quality standard set by the USEPA. Manganese levels are not regulated in public water supplies. According to AB 890, health effects from manganese are not a concern until concentrations are approximately 10 times higher, and at concentrations greater than 50 ppb manganese may become noticeable in tap water by imparting a rust color, off-taste or odor, or causing staining on plumbing and clothing. Typically laboratory test can detect down to 20 ppb manganese concentration. One ppb is equivalent to 1 drop of water in 42,000 gallons of water.

If the question is referring to percentage of manganese reported in Table 3 of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report, the percentage is the estimated amount of manganese contributed by each water source out of the total that serves the City of Maywood. For example, the amount of manganese from Maywood Avenue Well accounted for 45% of total amount of manganese in water served to the City of Maywood in 2009.

1.2 Why are there more samples in the company 2 than in the other companies?

RESPONSE: Testing is being done for different purposes. It is the water company's choice to do extra testing. This helps us monitor the manganese level at the water distribution system and make adjustments to any changes in manganese levels in a timely manner.

1.3 Up until now, what have you done to better the situation?

RESPONSE: Some of the actions taken by the water companies to improve water quality include water main flushing, water blending, installing water treatment plant, and purchasing Central Basin Municipal Water District (imported) water at higher prices. The problem is being worked every day and will continue to be worked on. Flushing helps remove rust and contaminants from the water mains, and is part of the California Department of Public Health requirements. Water blending is conducted to reduce the contaminant levels and ensure that drinking water standards are continuously attained in the delivered water. Water blending is a practice accepted by the California Department of Public Health. Water quality data indicate that currently Maywood's water quality meets the state drinking water standards. Maywood wáter companies are working to reduce the manganese level in their wáter supply.

Maywood Mutual Water Company #1 has been working on reducing the level of manganese that our customers receive at the homes by blending, a plan that has been approved by the State of California. We have also concentrated on our infrastructure needs such as install new water pipelines, valves, fire hydrants, meters, new copper customer service lines, automated computer electrical controls and purchasing construction equipment to be able to repair and improve our water system. We have also applied for state grants for a treatment plant to treat our water.

1.4 Did you translate the document?

RESPONSE: Yes, Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report was translated to Spanish and it is available on the city's website. The Maywood Water Companies paid for the translation as a courtesy to the City of Maywood and our customers.

1.5 **Company #1**

1.5.1 How efficient is it to use the flushing method to clean the pipes?

RESPONSE: A well-run water company will have an ongoing program of flushing and cleaning the distribution pipes to ensure that pipes are as clean as possible. Otherwise, rust, iron, manganese and other sediments will accumulate on the bottom of the pipes. Flushing is done to remove as much as possible for cleaner water in the distribution system pipelines.

1.5.2 What happens with the Manganese that will remain in the pipes when you change the water source *(could also be translated: "fountain")*

RESPONSE: It has been reported that old iron and galvanized residential lines cause rusty or yellowish water, but discoloration does not necessarily indicate presence of manganese. If the water delivered has lower manganese concentrations, water quality will generally improve over time, but rust problem may persist particularly where old galvanized residential lines exist. Rust is removed by flushing.

1.5.3 How will you clean the pipes?

RESPONSE: Water mains are cleaned by flushing. We will continue with flushing the water system as part of an ongoing program of cleaning the distribution pipes to ensure that pipes are as clean as possible. Otherwise, rust, iron, manganese and other sediments will accumulate on the bottom of the pipes. Many more infrstructure improvements will always be ongoing.

1.5.4 How long will the Manganese last after the interventions?

RESPONSE: Generally, as soon as water with lower levels of manganese is pushed through the pipes, the overall level of manganese will drop.

1.5.5 How do you balance the healthier with the most economical to resolve the problems?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Co. #1 has never balance cost versus health risk of our customers. The water we serve to our customers is safe. We follow the guidelines of the United States EPA, and are under the authority of the California Department of Public Health drinking water program central region. If the situation should arise were the water we serve is suspected to be harmful in anyway to the public. The California Department of Public Health will make us issue a Boil Water Order or a Do Not Drink Order within 24 hours or less after being notified by the laboratory that there is a problem. Once the Boil Water Order or a Do Not Drink Order has been issued only the California Department of Public Health can lift the order. At this time we have applied to the state for a grant to build a manganese treatment plant, we believe that this plant will resolve our manganese issues.

1.5.6 What results do you have of other contaminants?
TCE -
Perchlorate -

RESPONSE: Maywood water companies' wells are tested for possible contaminants including perchlorate, TCE, and other constituents required for regulatory compliance. The test results are provided in the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) for each water company. Copies of the Consumer Confidence Reports are available from Maywood mutual water companies and California Department of Public Health. TCE and perchlorate were tested to be non-detect from our wells, water tanks and water system.

1.6 **Company #2**

1.6.1 How many people do you serve?

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 serves approximately 6,700 residents.

1.6.2 How much right do you have to underwater water?

RESPONSE: 912 acre-feet

1.6.3 How much does WRD charge you for the water and how much do you charge us?

RESPONSE: Adjudicated water right per one acre-foot (325,851 gallons) is $205.00 plus operations cost. Customers pay $2.25 per 748 gallons plus bi-monthly charge depending on the meter size posted in our bi-monthly water bill.

5/8 and 3/4	$15.00
1 inch	$20.00
1 1/4-1 1/2	$35.00
2 inches	$60.00
3 inches	$130.00
4 inches	$190.00

1.6.4 How much would Central Basin charge you?

RESPONSE: Central Basin Municipal Water District (imported water) charges approximately $855 to $980 per acre-foot (325,851 gallons) depending on water usage, plus a fee of over $500 per month.

1.6.5 How much would you charge us?

RESPONSE: Customers pay $2.25 per 748 gallons plus bi-monthly charge depending on the meter size posted in our bi-monthly water bill.

1.6.6 Why do you charge for a product that is not good *(could also be translated: that does not work)*

RESPONSE: The cost of the manganese treatment (oxidation and filtration) system has not been included in the bill to date.

1.6.7 Why have you not taken outside water?

RESPONSE: Central Basin Municipal Water District (imported water) is approximately 2.5 to 4 times more expensive than the cost of local groundwater. Furthermore, local groundwater meets all the drinking wáter standards detailed in the federal drinking wáter act.

1.6.8 Why do you charge us so much if you are taking water from the well?
Compared with other companies that purchase the water from other sources and charge less?

RESPONSE: Every company has their own governing board and will do the best for their customers. The cost depends on the size of the distribution system and their needs.

1.6.9 Why did you not take samples of TCE and Perchlorate?

RESPONSE: All Maywood water companies' wells are tested for perchlorate and TCE. The test results are provided in the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) for each water company.

1.6.10 The estimate that you give is based on what?

RESPONSE: The cost estimate of $1 million to $1.5 million for pipeline provided in the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report is a preliminary estimate based on typical engineering and construction costs, not an actual quote. If an option is selected, several quotes will be obtained to keep the cost down.

1.6.11 What other estimates do you have?

RESPONSE: The estimated costs will be obtained when an option has been selected.

1.6.12 What results do you have from other contaminants?

1.6.12.1 TCE

1.6.12.2 Perchlorate

1.6.12.3Organic Materials?

RESPONSE: All Maywood water companies' wells are tested for possible contaminants including perchlorate, TCE, and other organic materials required for regulatory compliance. The test results are provided in the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) for each water company.

1.6.13 How much will it cost to replace the pipes?

RESPONSE: Water main replacement cost will be very high (approximately $1 million per mile).

1.6.14 What is your final number?

RESPONSE: A final cost estímate for the improvements has not yet derived by Maywood Mutual Water Company #2. A final cost estímate can be provided after the options have been selected and decisions have been made.

1.6.15 What are your plans to improve the pipes?

RESPONSE: The plan is to continue flushing the water mains to help remove rust and contaminants from the water mains, as part of the California Department of Public Health requirements. Water main replacement cost will be very high (approximately $1 million per mile).

1.6.16 Why does the water taste like chlorine?

RESPONSE: Chlorine is used to disinfect the water, some people are more sensitive to the smell but the levels of chlorine are kept below 1.0 parts per billion (ppb), while on wells and 2.5 ppb while on Metropolitan (imported) water. The legal limit for chlorine is 4.0 ppb.

1.7 Company #3

1.7.1 Where does the contamination come from?

RESPONSE: Investigating the source of TCE or perchlorate is not within the scope of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report or AB890. The California Department of Public Health and EPA conducted studies and were unable to determine the source of TCE. Perchlorate is not a problem. Perchlorate was only detected once and it was non detect in more than a dozen tests taken monthly in 2009 and 2010.

1.7.2 What are you doing in regards to those responsible for the TCE contamination?

RESPONSE: Testing and making sure that the levels remain below the MCL average for a 6 month period.

1.7.3 What are you doing to answer to the problem of Perchlorate? Source(s), those responsible, etc.

RESPONSE: Perchlorate is not a problem. Perchlorate was only detected once and it was non detect in more than a dozen tests taken monthly in 2009 and 2010.

1.7.4 What are you doing about the chlorine taste and smell?

RESPONSE: Chlorine is used to disinfect the water, some people are more sensitive to the smell but the levels of chlorine are kept below 1.0 parts per billion (ppb), while on wells and 2.5 ppb while on Metropolitan (imported) water. The legal limit for chlorine is 4.0 ppb.

Translated by: Pablo E. Martinez.
Translation Style: literal (no grammatical editing from original document)
Word Count: 373

AB 890 Water Quality Assessment Report
Public Hearing – March 5, 2011

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

QUESTIONS from Maywood Community Interagency Partnership, March 5, 2011

RESPONSE by Maywood Mutual Water Company #1, Maywood Mutual Water Company #2, and Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 are in BLUE colored text

---

Section 2.4. page 6: The problem with the 20-mile radius
"Manganese data published in the 2009 CCRs (spell it out) for the communities located within a 20-mile radius of the City of Maywood were reviewed to determine the manganese levels in their drinking water. Based on the available data from a total of 113 water providers in 2009, the average manganese concentration for the communities within a 20-mile radius of Maywood (not including Maywood mutuals) is 13.7 ug/L (which is below the manganese reporting limit of 20 ug/L). Manganese was reported as not **detected** at a reporting limit of 20 ug/L in approximately 88% of the CCRs. " (2.4, pg.6)

Q: What is the detection limit for manganese? We are confused by the language because rather than using reporting limit why not use the detection limit?

RESPONSE: 20 ug/L is the reporting limit and not the detection limit, as correctly indicated in the Report. Laboratory detection limits describe the minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured, but the reporting limit provides lowest concentration that can be reliably measured or "defensible." Reporting limits are shown and described in footnotes below the tables in the Report, for example, manganese ND(20) means manganese was not detected above the reporting limit of 20 ug/L.

Section 3.1.2, page 7: Long Term Approaches
Well Profiling: Water Co. 1
"In 2010 WRD began well profiling of *Well #4 to determine whether aquifers low in manganese concentrations are present and whether the zones that have high manganese concentrations can be sealed off. The well profiling results are being reviewed by WRD for further action. Alternatively, install a replacement well completed in aquifers low in manganese concentrations, if feasible. This option requires further investigation.* (3.1.2, *pg.* 7)

Our comments/questions
Q: Please explain to us what you mean by well profiling? We would like to see the results of the well profiling. We agree that this option requires further investigation.

RESPONSE: Well profiling is a test performed inside an existing water well to determine the amount of water flow and water quality at different depths within a well.

Q: How much does it cost to investigate the well?

RESPONSE: Typically well profiling may cost approximately from $25,000 to $50,000 and may take two to three months to complete depending on various factors.

Q: When will the profiling results be available?

RESPONSE: Well profiling results of Well #4 can be requested from Maywood Mutual Water Company #1.

Section 3.2: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2
Information in the report states that the water provided to the City of Maywood by Water Company #2 is by pumping groundwater- They are not providing any water from the Metropolitan Water District. Yet both wells used by Water Company #2 have manganese levels exceeding the SMCL.

We have the following questions:

Q: Maywood Water Company #2, provides over half of the drinking water in the City, approximately 53%. Why doesn't Water Company #2 use the available Metropolitan Water District Water?

RESPONSE: The cost of buying Central Basin Municipal Water District (imported) water is approximately 2.5 to 4 times higher than the local groundwater, without operation costs. A manganese treatment plant has been installed to reduce manganese levels in local groundwater. The treatment system is expected to be in operation by May/June 2011.

Q: On April 10, 2009 Water Company #1 received a letter from DPH that well #4 was exceeding the levels of manganese. We want to know if Water Company #2 received a similar letter. If this letter was received, what requirements were imposed on Water Company #2 to reduce manganese levels in the water? We request that Water Company #2 must follow the same DPH standards.

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 was forced to sign a compromising letter with CDPH in 2007/2008 to install a treatment plant to alleviate the manganese levels in the 52nd Street well site. Subsequently, the water company never received any citation regarding these issues.

Section 2.1, page 4
Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 produced a total of approximately 1,179 acre-feet of water in 2009, of which approximately 97% (1,144 acre-feet) was served to the City of Maywood, according to the Maywood Mutual Water Company #2." (2.1, pg 4)

Section 3.2, page 8:
"Maywood Avenue Well (61.7 ug/L) and 52nd Street Well (73.3 ug/L) in the Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 system have levels of manganese over the SMCL. The MWD source has lower manganese levels and is available but was not used in 2009." (3.2, pg.8)
"Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 is completing construction and testing of a manganese removal system at the 52nd Street site, once the system is tested and permitted manganese from this well will be below the AB 890 levels." (3.2, Pg, 8)

Our Questions:
Q: Please explain why blending filtrated water that contains high levels of manganese equals treated water or good quality water?

RESPONSE: Filtrated (treated) water does not contain high levels of manganese. Treated water would contain no or very low manganese concentrations.

Q: Why is it taking so long to get the filtration system to work? The residents are paying more for their water as a result of the filtering system financing since January 2009, but are not enjoying the benefit of water with less manganese, this is not fair.

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 - The treatment plant installation has been completed. We are in the process of the adjustment of the treatment plant, validation testing, and commissioning testing. We expect to incorporate the treatment plant into our distribution system in May/June 2011. The cost of the treatment plant has not been included in the bill to date.

Filtration (treatment) system operation was not part of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report or AB890.

Q: When will the 52nd St filtration system come on line? Please provide a specific date.

RESPONSE: Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 - The treatment plant installation has been completed. We are in the process of the adjustment of the treatment plant, validation testing, and commissioning testing. We expect to incorporate the treatment plant into our distribution system in May/June 2011.

Section 3.2.1 [1] page 8: Short Term Measures
"The short term plan is to operate the 52nd Street treatment plant. Maywood Avenue Well water is available to blend with the treated 52nd Street water to produce water at 80% below the SMCL for manganese, if necessary. In order to meet AB 890 requirements significantly more blending will be required at an additional operational expense." (3.2.1 [1] Pg. 8)

Q: Please elaborate and describe the process that will be used to blend the water in detail? How will the water be blended with the filtrated water from 52nd St.?

RESPONSE: Under the short-term plan water from the Maywood Avenue Well can be blended with the treated water from the 52nd Street plant by pumping the Maywood Avenue Well water into the grid system.

The Community wants to bring to your attention our concerns about an increase in water prices and fees being charged by Water Company #2. We are concerned that Water Company #2, which is charging more then water Company #3 for water delivery, is passing on the costs to their customers for the Manganese Filtering System (Loan of $1.1 million with zero interest.) The Community believes that the cost of this filtration system should not be passed onto the community. Customers of Water Company #2 should be reimbursed tor any fees paid to cover the cost of the installed filtration system. This is particularly justified for the period of time when the filtering system is not operational.

Q: How can you justify the higher fees that residents from Water Co. #2 are paying, when the filtration system is not in operation?

RESPONSE: Burden of costs was not part of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report nor specified in AB890 but cost details can be provided by Maywood Mutual Water Company #2.

Q: Please provide a break-down of the charges and costs residents are forced to pay. We demand to clearly understand the fees and charges we are paying.

RESPONSE: Burden of costs was not part of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report nor specified in AB890 but cost details can be provided by Maywood Mutual Water Company #2.

Q: The residents in Maywood Co. #2 are already being charged for additional costs. AB 890 clearly states that residents should not be overburdened by having to pay any additional costs. Why are you charging residents living in Water Company #2 service area extras fees since 2009 when the community is already overburdened?

RESPONSE: AB 890 does not state who should bear the burden of costs. Burden of costs was not part of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report nor specified in AB890 but cost details can be provided by Maywood Mutual Water Company #2.

Section 3.2.2, page 8: Long Term Approaches
"The long term solution to the problem is to pipe Maywood Avenue Well water to the 52nd Street site for treatment, if feasible. A dedicated pipeline of approximately 6,000 linear feet of 10-inch pipe would be required. The capacity of the existing plant would also need to be increased. Estimated cost for these improvements would be in the order of $1 to 1.5 *million. Alternatively investigate whether the Maywood Avenue Well can be modified or a new replacement well can be installed to produce from aquifers that have low manganese levels, if appropriate.* " (3.2.2, *pg. 8)*

Our questions:
Q: Why isn't there another option available here?

RESPONSE: Appropriate options have been provided in the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report. The only other option would be use only purchased water, which is at least 2.5 to 4 times more expensive.

Q: Why would you pipe it to the treatment plant on 52nd Street?

RESPONSE: Maywood Avenue Well can be piped to the treatment plant on 52nd Street for treatment as an option to lower its manganese level.

Q: The cost is 1.5 million dollars? How does it make sense to build additional piping to the 52nd street treatment plant rather than installing a similar treatment plant at the other well? Has anyone done a cost comparison between the improvements required at the three water companies and the cost of using Metropolitan Water District water instead? This cost

comparison should be completed and shared with the community.

RESPONSE: The $1.5 million includes piping and increasing capacity of the existing treatment plant, and would be more cost effective than a separate stand alone treatment plant. Using Central Basin Municipal Water District (imported) water is an option (3.2, page 8). The cost of the imported water is approximately 2.5 to 4 times higher than allocated groundwater. No feasibility studies have been conducted between the three water companies. Cost comparison of various options was not part of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report nor specified in AB890 but a cost comparison can be completed by the water companies and shared with the community when available.

Q: Please provide a break-down of the cost between the dedicated pipeline and the increased capacity of the 52nd Street plan at a cost of 1.5 million.

RESPONSE: A detailed cost analysis was not conducted by Maywood Mutual Water Company #2. A detailed cost analysis was not part of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report nor specified in AB890 but it can be completed by the water company and shared with the community.

Q: Why not abandon the wells being used by Water Co. # 2 and obtain water from the other wells in the Maywood area?

RESPONSE: Abandoning Maywood Mutual Water Company #2 wells would not be appropriate because there are no other wells in the other Maywood mutual water companies that may be able to provide needed water at this time nor is there any guarantee that any new well will not have manganese in it.

Section 3.3, page 8 and 9: Maywood Mutual Water Company #3
Trichloroethylene (TCE) levels in the Prospect Well and Warehouse Well were found to be as *high* as *approximately* 80 *to 90%* of *the Primary MCL of* 5 ug/*L in 2009. The water production from Prospect Well* was *lowered from* 48.1% *of the system total in 2009 to 19.6% in 2010 due to concerns with TCE.* "(3.3, *pg. 819)*

Our questions:
Q: Has TCE been found in 2011? And if so, what is the concentration?

RESPONSE: Yes, TCE has been found in the Prospect Well and Warehouse Well in 2011. This information will be available in the 2010 Consumer Confidence Report to be published by July 1, 2011.

Q: Can you inform the community on the health risks of TCE?

RESPONSE: Health risk assessment was not part of the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report nor specified in AB890. The California Department of Public Health provides the following information on TCE:

Trichloroethylene, commonly referred to as TCE, is a volatile, chlorinated hydrocarbon widely

used as a solvent, paint stripper, and degreasing agent. Patterns of TCE contamination of drinking water generally parallel use patterns, with the highest levels and highest number of contaminated wells occurring in urban areas. Over 350 drinking water sources in California have reportable levels of TCE contamination (i.e., greater than 0.5 ppb). Systems with contamination exceeding the MCL are required to provide treatment that lowers TCE concentrations to levels below 5 parts per billion (ppb).

Cancer is the primary health concern from TCE exposure. Depending on the particular exposure scenario, animal study, and tumor site selected in the PHG (Public Health Goal) risk analysis, the range of drinking water concentrations within *the de minimis* level (10^{-6}; one excess cancer case in one million people exposed over a lifetime of 70 years) ranges from 0.1 to 64 ppb. Since the 5 ppb MCL is within that range, it meets the acceptable risk level of 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} that Federal and State regulatory agencies use for establishing drinking water MCLs to protect public health. Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) is the highest level of a contaminant that is allowed in drinking water.

Q: How is TCE being treated?

RESPONSE: TCE levels in the Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 wells are below the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) drinking water standard; and therefore, no TCE treatment is necessary. If TCE levels were to exceed the MCL, the well would be taken out of service until the TCE levels were reduced below the MCL. The wells are tested to make sure that the TCE levels remain below the MCL average for a 6 month period.

Section 3.3.1, pg.9 Short Term Measure

"On a *short term basis the Maywood Mutual Water Company* #3 *has reduced its use of the Prospect well and is blending this water with other sources. This option can reduce the TCE concentration to within 80% (4.0 uglL) of the MCL, but not to the AB 890 level (0.47 uglL, or less than the TCE.* "(3.1.1, *pg.9)*

Q: Can you explain why the TCE concentration can not be reduced to the level stated in AB 890?

RESPONSE: The option of blending three Maywood Mutual Water Company #3 wells cannot reduce the TCE concentration to AB 890 level (0.47 ug/L) because the blended water would likely contain TCE higher than 0.47 ug/L. District Well alone cannot provide enough water.

Q: What are the options of getting the Prospect Well to the level of 0.47 ug/L as stated in AB 890?

RESPONSE: Approaches for reducing the TCE concentration in Prospect Well to 0.47 ug/L need to be investigated. They include the following:

- Modify Prospect Well by sealing off sections that are producing the TCE, if appropriate;
- Install a TCE removal plant at the Prospect Well or Warehouse Well; and/or
- Install a new well.

Q: Is Well #7, the Warehouse Well still being used since it had the highest concentration of TCE? (please refer to table 4: pg. 9)

RESPONSE: Yes, the Warehouse Well is used if TCE levels are below the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) drinking water standard. The well is tested regularly to make sure that the TCE levels remain below the MCL. If TCE levels were to exceed the MCL, the well would be taken out of service until the TCE levels were reduced below the MCL.

Q: "The level will not get to the level of AB 890". Please explain what this means. This statement in the report is unacceptable to the community. If this well is being used, adequate monitoring is essential.

RESPONSE: The phrase "The level will not get to the level of AB 890" is not from the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report. If the question is referring to the following phrase, "*This option can reduce the TCE concentration to within 80% (4.0 uglL) of the MCL, but not to the AB 890 level (0.47 uglL, or less than the TCE"*, a response has been provided on previous page.

Q. Can you please explain and provide the laboratory detection and reporting limits because they are not the same on all the contaminants.

RESPONSE: Laboratory detection limits and reporting limits both describe the minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured, but reporting limit provides lowest concentration that can be reliably measured or "defensible." Reporting limits are shown and described in footnotes below the tables in the Report, for example, manganese ND(20) means manganese was not detected above the reporting limit of 20 ug/L and TCE ND(0.5) means TCE was not detected above the reporting limit of 0.5 ug/L.

Section 4.0, pg. 10 (Manganese and TCE Removal Technologies:
Q: Please explain all the acronyms you have in your letter and define them. (Jacque please verify page number) Pg. 4

RESPONSE: A full name of every acronym is provided at the first occurrence of each acronym in the Maywood Water Quality Assessment Report.

Q: Please list all the funding resources that are available to address the Maywood drinking water problems.

RESPONSE: The funding resources that maybe available to address the Maywood drinking water problems are listed in Section 5.0 of the Report.