



TO : Mr John Feil, Executive Director, National Competition Council, GPO
BOX 250B Melbourne Vic 3001

FROM : Laurence Jones, 5 Boorook St, Buddina Sunshine Coast, Queensland, 4575

DATE : 5 / 5 / 2004

PHONE : {07}54441938

MOB: 0404051055

Attention Mr Feil

I am writing to you in relation to the document released by Services Sydney titled 'Application under Part 111A of the Trade Practices Act 1974 requesting recommendation that Sewage Transmission and Interconnection Services provided by Sydney Water Corporation Ltd be declared'. I want it to go on record that I strongly object to the manner in which this issue is being handled by both Services Sydney and the National Competition Council (NCC). The residents of Sydney have not been properly, truthfully nor adequately informed regarding Services Sydney's application. The fact is that if the application is successful, it will result in treated sewage wastewater being directly inserted into Sydney's drinking water supply mains. I also believe that the application submitted by Services Sydney has been designed in a manner that is purposely misleading. Furthermore I believe that by allowing certain sections of the application to be confidential, the NCC has not acted in the public's best interest.

I strongly oppose the application submitted by Services Sydney for the following reasons.

Firstly, the short and long term impacts on human health of drinking treated sewage wastewater directly inserted into a city's drinking supply, as is planned, are unknown. Nowhere in the world has any community consumed sewage wastewater sourced from industry, hospitals, abattoirs' and domestic residence's that has been directly inserted into their drinking water supply mains. Do you

believe it would be in the public's best interests to be used as guinea pigs for this intergenerational experiment?

Secondly, Services Sydney's submission highlights the use of advanced treatment processes to treat wastewater to a standard suitable for human consumption. Services Sydney can in **absolutely no way guarantee** that the contaminants (including hormone disrupting chemicals) that have a detrimental effect on human health have been completely removed from the effluent by these processes. The fact is that any advanced technology used in this process is relatively new and largely untested. The only reliable long-term measure to determine how successful this process is in removing all contaminants, is to monitor the local hospitals and medical centres for health effects on the community over the preceding 1-25 years. The thought of another disaster like Sydney's 1998 Cryptosporidium crisis will pale into insignificance as opposed to the potential deaths associated with this concept if Services Sydney's application is successful.

Thirdly, Services Sydney intention to release treated sewage wastewater that contains chemicals, drugs etc, into rivers streams and existing dams that supply Sydney's drinking water, is, I believe, immoral, illegal and environmental vandalism. This proposal will cause irreversible damage to both the natural environment (including wildlife) and most importantly human health. As mentioned above, Services Sydney cannot guarantee that all of the contaminants (including hormone disrupting chemicals) present in sewage wastewater have been removed. Australia is such an environmentally conscious society. Do we really want to introduce a process to treat sewage effluent that is not only detrimental to the health of humans but also has a deadly effect on our beautiful natural environment and wildlife?

I bring to your attention two books that clearly outline the risks associated with how man-made chemicals are threatening our fertility, intelligence and survival. They are "Our Stolen Future" by Theo Colborn, John Meyers and

**Dianne Dumanoski and "The Feminization of Nature" by Deborah Cadbury
– "Our Future At Risk " .**

Fourthly, I believe that under the Services Sydney's Application , Sydney Water's current monopoly involving sewage will be transferred to Services Sydney , a fact confirmed by Services Sydney's own application on page 17 – 5.4 **" While Services Sydney intends to develop infrastructure capable of processing 100% of sewage currently collected by Sydney Water -----"**.

Where is the competition ?

Under Services Sydney's terms and conditions , what chance is there of competition ?

Fifthly,

NO MORE OCEAN OUTFALLS. NO MORE DAMS . TREATED SEWAGE WASTEWATER TO SUPPLY SYDNEY'S DRINKING WATER INSTEAD.

Services Sydney Application states that under their proposal ocean outfalls and dams will no longer be needed. Their application leaves absolutely no doubt that Sydney's future drinking water supply is to come from treated sewage wastewater sourced from industry , homes , abattoirs and hospitals. This fact is also confirmed by the following statements inserted in Services Sydney's application.

{1 "Enhancing the water supply to the Sydney community " .

{2 "used for human consumption – with further treatment to a potable standard"

{3 " to return tertiary treated water to the base of Sydney's catchment dams ---"

{4 "potential to use high quality reclaimed water for environmental flows in the New South Wales rivers supporting the Sydney water catchment area ---"

{5 " potential in the long term for the supply of high quality reclaimed water to Sydney's drinking water supply " .

SINGAPORE :

SERVICES SYDNEY uses Singapore's use of Planned Indirect Potable Reuse to gain community support for its introduction in Sydney but on closer scrutiny, Singapore's experience is irrelevant.

Services Sydney's application states :

" this technology is in use in cities such as Singapore where reclaimed water is blended into the drinking water storages" –

Taken from the Internet :

***" Pub has also completed its evaluation of the Expert Panels report and accepted the proposal to use NEWater for indirect potable use in Sep 2002. This means mixing and blending NEWater with raw water in the reservoir ---
---. PUB has introduced 3 mgd of NEWater { about 1 % of total daily water consumption } into our raw water reservoir. This amount will be increased progressively to about 2.5 % of total daily water consumption by 2011".***

Internet material goes on to say : " Water reclamation is a growing trend in the US, and around the world . In the US there are several other water reclamation projects that are now being planned or under construction".

The above statement in relation to the US is disputed in Queensland's Water Recycling Strategy { QWRS} released in Oct 2001, it states :

" There is only one operational scheme involving surface water storage in the USA { Crook, 1999 ; USEPA 2001. The National Research Council of the USA { NRC} has investigated the viability of this type of indirect potable reuse { National Research Council 1998 }. While it identified no obvious health effects, it observed that the existing data was sparse and of a limited nature".

{ The old saying, if you don't test for it, you can't find it and it can't be a problem}.

The QWRS goes on to state :

" Some existing and planned projects in the US have not met any open public opposition: but some consumers may have been unaware that they were, or would be, drinking recycled water ". Conversely, public and

political pressure based primarily on health concerns, recently caused the rejection of a proposed aquifer recharge system and the indefinite postponement of two proposed indirect potable use schemes based on surface water storages in the USA { Crook 1999}”.

Singapore’s experience with indirect potable reuse is so successful that “ Pub is also planning to build desalination plants”.

Why should a decision made by the National Competition Council be responsible for forcing Sydney residents to accept a concept that is not accepted by US citizens because of health concerns? One can only wonder how many Singapore residents are aware that they are drinking treated sewage wastewater ? Services Sydney’s intention to close all three ocean outfalls and return the treated effluent to Sydney’s water supply can in no way be compared to Singapore’s use of treated sewage wastewater.

Sixthly:

The Connell Wagner Report .

Services Sydney’s application uses the Connell Wagner Report to support their application to access Sydney’s sewage, a move that will see Sydney Water’s monopoly transferred to Services Sydney , despite the termination of the Heads of Agreement by Sydney Water before the reports release. Under these circumstances Services Sydney’s use of this report and the following statement is beyond belief.

The Report states :

“ No significant impediments or flaws have been identified. There are significant potential benefits for Sydney Water from each of the system elements across all of the technical, environmental, social, regulatory and project financing aspects”.

So why did Sydney Water terminate the Heads of Agreement if there was ‘potential benefits’ to be gained?

Obviously Sydney Water realised that under Services Sydney's Application they would be greatly disadvantaged and it would result in:

{1} Services Sydney having a monopoly in that they would be treating all of Sydney's sewage.

{2} Sydney Water would not only lose their monopoly to treat Sydney's sewage, but also lose that part of their businesses that produces a very good cash flow used for maintenance of their entire system.

{3} Services Sydney owning and controlling Sydney's future drinking water supply.

{4} Sydney Water finding in excess of \$100 million to fund extra treatment processes that would be needed at the Prospect Water Treatment Plant that supplies 85 % of Sydney's water in order to treat sewage wastewater for human consumption. The consortium that built, owns, and operates the privately owned Prospect Plant { for a 25 year period }, Suez Lyonnaise des Eaux and Lend Lease is not contracted to pay for or include such process.

If Services Sydney's application to the National Competition Council is successful and the company introduces planned Indirect and direct potable reuse it will create several serious problems for Sydney Water. The licence and operating requirements for the Suez Lyonnaise des Eaux and Lend Lease owned Prospect Water Treatment Plant do not include conditions requiring the removal of the contaminants that are present in sewage. One only has to remember the 1998 Sydney Water Crisis and the failure of the Prospect Water Treatment Plant to remove the parasites Giardia and Cryptosporidium.

Are any of the above either in the publicly owned Sydney Water's best interest or in the public's best interest ?

REFERENCE TO THE DECLARATION CRITERIA :

7-1 "Council must not recommend the declaration of a service unless it is satisfied that a range of listed matters are met".

This section also sets out my reasons , some already mentioned above, why Services Sydney's application does not satisfy each of the Declaration Criteria. Access by Services Sydney to the service not only hands the company a monopoly in the treatment of Sydney's sewage, but also a monopoly involving Sydney's future water supply. { Remember, NO MORE DAMS : CLOSE DOWN EXISTING OCEAN OUTFALLS: }

IT DOES NOT PROMOTE COMPETITION IN ANY SHAPE OR FORM.

Services Sydney uses the Competition Tribunal's decision to privatise Sydney Airport as promoting competition. The National Competition Council's decision to allow private ownership of airports has failed to create competition. One example, the process has handed the owners of the Brisbane Airport a monopoly. Another is the now privately owned and operated Prospect Water Treatment Plant. How does handing control of 85% of Sydney's water supply to a private company create competition ? The process did cause Sydney Water to lose control over the middle of their water supply pipeline and created the worst water crisis in Sydney's and Australia's history. Prior to privatisation and the 1998 Water Crisis, Sydney Water had an excellent record on the protection of human health involving their water supply

USA & NEW ZEALAND'S EXPERIENCES WITH PRIVATISATION OF PUBLIC OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE :

Examples overseas of what can go wrong when publicly owned power networks were replaced with private ownership in the USA and New Zealand. Both had disastrous, long term results .

Was any of the above in the public's best interest ?

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND SERVICES SYDNEY:

Their application states : "Services Sydney has conducted market research that indicates that customers are prepared to switch providers of sewage

collection services having regard to questions of price, sustainability, and quality of service”.

We will never know what information Services Sydney supplied to the public in the survey because for some unknown reason the National Competition Council has allowed Services Sydney's 'Social Survey of Customer Preferences' to be classified as 'CONFIDENTIAL'?

It is a fact that History has proven through community consultations that the public does not support planned indirect or direct potable reuse of treated sewage wastewater. Did Services Sydney inform the surveyed that they intend introducing both? Did the company inform the public that under the monopoly created and without competition that they set the price, that releasing treated sewage wastewater into rivers, streams and dams is not sustainable or that the introduction of direct potable reuse as is planned here will involve them and their families in a world first intergenerational {25 year} experiment. The answer lies in the statement below.

“ The services provided by Services Sydney will be functionally identical to those provided by Sydney Water-----“.

The Report went on to say :

“ customers are prepared to pay more for an environmentally superior solution “.

Services Sydney's solution to pump treated sewage wastewater containing chemicals, endocrine disrupters, drugs, viruses, pathogens etc into the rivers, streams and dams that supply Sydney's water, and directly into Sydney's drinking water mains certainly could not be described as a superior option to the present deep water ocean outfall system. One does wonder if the respondents to Services Sydney's market research were informed that the processes they intend using in line are experimental and basically untested for their intended use.

“ ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR SOLUTION “

Services Sydney's own application acknowledges that the use by Sydney Water of deep water ocean outfalls ensures the health and safety of over 4,000,000 Sydney residents :” Sydney’s Sewage Reticulation Network clearly meets ---- because it ensures the health and safety of over 4-000-000 people”. On one hand Sydney Water’s deep ocean outfalls work simply because of the massive dilution factor while on the other Services Sydney’s proposal is experimental , will cause irreparable damage both to the living environment and human health. Is that a superior solution ? Would it be in the public’s best interest to introduce this concept ?

CAN SYDNEY RESIDENTS TRUST SERVICES SYDNEY TO TREAT THEIR SEWAGE TO A STANDARD SUITABLE FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION ?

Private infrastructure group Services Sydney’s wants all of Sydney’s residents to trust them with their most precious resource , their water supply by allowing them to design, own, build and operate infrastructure which they say will allow the company to treat Sydney’s sewage for use in rivers , dams and streams and for reuse as drinking water inserted into the water supply mains without publicly supplying any detail of their proposed treatment process or any proof that these processes will or can remove ALL of the contaminants, including endocrine disrupting chemicals, drugs, pathogens, viruses, etc, from Sydney’s sewage.

Has the public already been misled by Services Sydney in regards to this concept ?

In what could be regarded as an attempt by Services Sydney to obtain community acceptance for their application to treat sewage wastewater , use it for environmental flows and reuse it for human consumption they describe the sewage in their mains as “SIMPLY WATER “, page 4 section 3, while in the very same application they refer to the very same sewage that flows through Sydney Water’s mains as “ **CONTAMINATED SEWAGE**” - “**CONTAMINATED PRODUCT** “ page 4 and “**HAZARDOUS { TOXIC } COMPONENTS**“ on page 11.

Is Services Sydney's use of the words 'SIMPLY WATER' to gain public acceptance of this concept misleading ?

MEDIA ARTICLE :

Does this newspaper article mislead the public regarding this issue ?

Dated 11 / 04 / 2004 - ' Waste Away : The Bold Plan To Privatise Sydney Sewage ' , by Clarissa Bye , inserted in the Sun Herald states :

“ Services Sydney , an Australian owned firm , has put together a plan that would enable individual households to opt to have their sewage sent to a newly built treatment plant “. ' INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLDS' : Under Services

Sydney's application , this would be impossible , a fact confirmed by their own application before the National Competition Council , Page 3 where it states :

“ However , it is not economic {or sensible} to duplicate Sydney Water's sewage reticulation network for the transmission of sewage to sewage treatment plants in the Sydney area “. Choice , what choice ? Under Services Sydney's application there is no choice, one in all in.

and

“ thus, eliminate the need for a new dam “.

In order to eliminate the need for a new dam Sydney would need to introduce the reuse of treated sewage wastewater for human consumption . The article does not truthfully, honestly or clearly inform Sydney Residents that under Services Sydney's application that they will have treated sewage effluent derived from industry , homes , abattoirs and hospitals , directly inserted into their drinking water supply mains for human consumption . Furthermore , the introduction of this concept will not eliminate the need for a new dam, only delay, at best, Sydney's need for another dam.

All attempts to contact Clarissa Bye through The Sun Herald, both by phone and by mail have been unsuccessful. Is it possible that The Sun Herald does not regard this issue as important enough to be in the public's best interest to be fully informed?

Article, ' **RADICAL WATER CREDIT IDEA** ' written by Anne Davies and Stephanie Peatling , August 7 2003, printed in the Sydney Morning Herald and taken from the internet includes :

“ On a larger scale , a group of South African investors is hoping to build a \$ 1 million plant to recycle Sydney’s sewage . The company , Services Sydney , wants to mine effluent from the southern sewerage system , process it and reuse the water for boosting river flows as well as industrial and other uses “.

Clarissa Bye’s article states : “ Services Sydney , an Australian owned firm “? Australian owned it might be , but who else is involved and to what extent.

“ said Tony Feitelson , the Director of Services Sydney “ . But he refused to say whether the proposal involved recycling sewage back into drinking water” .

WHAT POSSIBLE REASONS COULD SERVICES SYDNEY HAVE THAT PREVENTS THEM FROM FULLY INFORMING THE PUBLIC OF THEIR INTENTIONS FOR SYDNEY’S WATER SUPPLY ?

Do any of the above articles indicate an unwillingness to be up front and honest with Sydney residents regarding Services Sydney’s future intentions for their water supply?

APPLICATION BY SERVICES SYDNEY FOR DECLARATION OF SEWAGE TRANSMISSION AND INTERCONNECTION SERVICES PROVIDED BY SYDNEY WATER : ISSUES PAPER : NATIONAL COMPETITION COUNCIL APRIL 2004 :

THE APPLICATION :

“ Services Sydney’s application describes the company as an infrastructure development company established to implement and operate specific solutions for sewage and water management in New South Wales.

The core of Services Sydney’s proposal {referred to as “ Sustaining the City “ } is the creation of a modern new platform for sewage treatment and disposal, potentially replacing the current ocean outfall system”.

Services Sydney’s Application’ { above} in no way shape or form mentions Planned Indirect Potable Reuse or Direct Potable Reuse of treated sewage wastewater. Does the use of the term “disposal “ instead of the term reuse represent an attempt by Services Sydney to mislead the public about Services Sydney’s intention to introduce potable { drinking } reuse of treated sewage wastewater. If so, one can only question the possible motives behind such an omission.

DECLARATION CRITERIA :

“The council cannot recommend that a service be declared unless the council is satisfied of all of the matters set out in s. 44G{2} of the TPA “.

{a} “That access {or increased access } to a service would promote competition in at least one market {whether or not in Australia }, other than the market for the service”.

I BELIEVE THAT I HAVE ALREADY PUT FORWARD AN ARGUMENT THAT IF SERVICES SYDNEY’S APPLICATION IS SUCCESSFUL IT WILL RESULT IN SERVICES SYDNEY OBTAINING A MONOPOLY. THERE WILL BE NO COMPETITION.

{b} As stated, the facility is of National significance but with inclusion of an extra clause :

{iv} Sydney Water’s continuing ownership and control over Sydney’s sewage is necessary in order to guarantee the ongoing safety and protection of human health and the living environment.

{d} “that access to the service can be provided without undue risk to human health or safety “.

MOST DEFINITELY I HAVE PROVEN BEYOND DOUBT THAT IF SERVICES SYDNEY'S APPLICATION IS SUCCESSFUL IT WILL LEAD TO AN UNACCEPTABLE SITUATION THAT WILL POSE AN UNDUE RISK TO HUMAN HEALTH, THE PUBLIC'S SAFETY AND A THREAT TO THE LIVING ENVIRONMENT.

In 2000, in direct response to the contents of the book 'Our Stolen Future' the American Congress directed the Environment Protection Agency {EPA} to commence immediate research into how many of the 100-000 chemicals in ever day use are endocrine disrupters. Nobody knows what happens when one or more chemicals combine but one things is certain, disruption begins at a very very low level – parts / trillion. The EPA'S research will take years.

{F} that access {or increased access} to the service would be contrary to the public's interest.

ONCE AGAIN , IS IT IN THE PUBLIC'S BEST INTEREST TO BE INVOLVED IN A WORLD FIRST INTERGENERATIONAL EXPERIMENT?

DESIGNATED MINISTER:

The National Competition Council cleared the way for the Corporatisation of Sydney Water which allowed private enterprise to own and control 85% of Sydney's water which the designated Minister approved.

THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD - GOOD WEEKEND MAGAZINE : Article written by Murray Hogarth –

'Through a Glass Darkly '- POWER, POLITICS AND THOSE PESKY PARASITES ... The murky trail that led to Sydney's water crisis '

No, this article is not about Services Sydney - It was written in Sep 1998 in relation to the government's role in awarding the contract to build, own and operate {BOO} Sydney's Prospect Water Treatment Plant, an Australian first.

The article states :

" Broad publicly highlighted the emerging threat from cryptosporidium to justify the private plans to critics, including green groups and a hostile parliamentary inquiry chaired by an Independent MP , Dr Peter Macdonald. Broad and Webster gave assurances that that the new plants would filter out 99-9% of the bug". " But, bizarrely, the final agreement for Prospect specifically EXCLUDED AWS from responsibility for targeting Cryptosporidium and Giardia. That crucial omission was UNKNOWN to the public until the recent crisis because of the tight secrecy surrounding the contracts".

QUEENSLAND STATE GOVERNMENT:

In 1996 the Queensland State Government awarded the contract to BOO the Noosa Sewerage Treatment Plant to the same consortium that built, owns and operates Sydney's Prospect Plant, Suez Lyonnaise des Eaux , once again for a period of twenty five years and again, an Australian first. At the opening of the plant it was described as being State Of The Art and the treated effluent good enough to drink. Recently, the EPA advised Noosa council to install a deep water ocean outfall because Burgess Creek into which the treated sewage wastewater enters before flowing into the surf, poses an unacceptable risk to human health. AS WITH THE PROSPECT CONTRACT, THE FINAL AGREEMENT SPECIFICALLY EXCLUDED AWS FROM RESPONSIBILITY FOR TESTING THE TREATED SEWAGE EFFLUENT LEAVING THE PLANT. THAT RESPONSIBILITY AND ASSOCIATED COST RESTS WITH NOOSA SHIRE COUNCIL .

SYDNEY WATER :

In 1994 REPRESENTATIVES from the top four environmental groups in New South Wales were allowed to become involved in Sydney Water's decision making process. Their involvement resulted in the inclusion of conditions in the Licence requirements and Special Sydney Water Corporate ACT that by 2010 all releases IN DRY WEATHER of treated sewage wastewater into a surface water

body such as a river, stream and ocean had to be NIL . These provisions would have forced Sydney Water to introduce Planned Indirect Potable Reuse of treated sewage wastewater by 2011. The 1998 Sydney Water Crisis changed all that. Not surprisingly the company Services Sydney was initiated in 1998 and is now taking steps to ensure that the introduction of potable reuse is not hindered.

SOME MORE RELEVANT HISTORY ON THIS CONCEPT:

The proposal to introduce potable reuse into Australia is not new.

1990 : Transnational companies involved in water supply and wastewater treatment entered the Australian market in response to the government's planned privatisation of Australia's \$80 Billion water and wastewater treatment infrastructure.

1992 : The United Nations Rio 'Earth Summit' was held resulting in Chapter 21.

1994 : Sydney's Prospect Water Treatment Plant that supplies 85% of Sydney's water was sold to private enterprise.

Sydney Water forced to plan to introduce Planned Indirect Potable Reuse of treated sewage wastewater by 2011.

1995 : The Caloundra / Maroochy Strategic Wastewater Management Study was initiated with **state government involvement**.

1996 : The local paper runs a story that Caboolture Shire Council intends introducing Planned Indirect Potable Reuse within 5 years and Direct Potable Reuse shortly after. Late 1996 Caboolture Shire Council is forced by the community to reject potable reuse.

1996 : Noosa Shire Council awards the contract to Build, Own, and Operate the Noosa Sewerage Treatment Plant to the Suez Lyonnaise des Eaux / Lend Lease Consortium for a 25 year period, another Australian first.

1997: Caloundra / Maroochy Strategic Wastewater Management Study adopted by both councils for planning purposes for the next 50 years.

Caloundra City Council's strategic plans included drawings for the construction of several Planned Indirect and Direct Potable Reuse Plants.

1998 : Caloundra City Council forced to reject potable reuse after receiving app 10-000 signatures against both proposals.

1998 : Services Sydney is initiated.

1998 : Requests are made to the Criminal Justice Commission {CJC} to have the C/MSWM Study investigated because of concerns involving possible fraud, collusion and official misconduct. The request is denied.

2001 : The Queensland State Government awards the contract to build a \$1 million Direct Potable Reuse Demonstration Plant.

The plant is owned by EPA , managed by the Qld Department of Natural Resources through their involvement in CIRM.

CIRM was the direct result of the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. CIRM has, un-be-known to the public, been carrying out research into and promoting the introduction of direct potable reuse since 1995.

2001: Requests are made to the CJC to have the tendering process which was carried out through the State Government investigated because of concerns. The request is denied.

2004 : Services Sydney applies to the National Competition Council to take control of Sydney's sewage, which, if successful will not only hand the company a monopoly but also result in Services Sydney owning and controlling Sydney's sewerage and with it , their future water supply.

ADVICE:

Some advice for those companies promoting this concept.

It is not difficult nor is it expensive to carry out a test of the effluent entering the sewerage treatment plant. If the first test identifies a particular contaminant and another test on the treated sewage effluent leaving the plant identifies the same contaminant , court action against those responsible will follow. Written or unwritten, all members of Parliament, all public owned utilities and privately owned companies have an obligation and responsibility to protect human health and the environment.

I would strongly suggest that the national Competition Council, Ministers, Councillors and all members of Parliament refer to the mountain of overseas research that now exists surrounding the impact of endocrine disrupting chemicals and drugs that pass through sewerage treatment plants even more toxic and that are causing irreparable damage to human health, wildlife and the environment.

I believe the arguments that I have presented will bring to the Council's attention the many risks, both known and unknown, associated with Services Sydney's Application and request that Services Sydney's application be rejected. Please do not allow the people of Sydney or their living environment to be used in this deadly experiment.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. Jones". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "L" and a trailing flourish.