

Meeting Minutes

Prepared for: Los Angeles County Public Works

Project Title: San Gabriel Valley Greenway Network Strategic Implementation Plan

Purpose of Meeting: Gather Feedback Related to the May Meeting, Discuss the Draft Project Prioritization Criteria, Review Updated Channel Information

Meeting Location: Virtual via Teams
See Microsoft Outlook Invite

Date: June 10, 2020

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Steering Committee Members

Jocelyn Rivera-Olivas, LAC B.O.S. SD4
Keith Lilley, LACFCD
Carolina Hernandez, LACFCD
Katie Ward, SGVCOG
Elaine Kunitake, LACPW TPP
Wesley Reutimann, Active SGV
Deborah Enos, WCA
Johnathan Perisho, WCA
Hannah Brunelle, SCAG
Mark Stanley, RMC
Norma Quinones, SGV Conservation Corps
Belinda Faustinos, Nature For All
Robin Mark, Trust For Public Land

Project Team

Enrique Baul, LACPW
Jennifer Aborida, LACPW
Lyndon Tat, LACPW
Michelle O'Connor, LACDPR
Natasha Krakowiak, LACDPR
Sheela Mathai, LACDPR
Loretta Quach, LACDPR
Lisa Skutecki, Brown and Caldwell
Rosey Jencks, Brown and Caldwell
Jesse Scolavino, Brown and Caldwell
Jan Dyer, Studio-MLA
Kevin Johnson, Studio-MLA
Jean Yang, Studio-MLA
Tony Howze, PACE
Mark Krebs, PACE
Esmeralda Garcia, MIG
Noe Noyola, MIG
Stephanie Lane Pavon, MIG

Meeting Summary

The meeting was held between the consultant team, the LACFCD team, and the Steering Committee members listed above. A summary of the meeting is as follows:

1. Introductions and welcoming remarks from LAC
 - Enrique from LACPW gave opening remarks and let the attendees know that comments were received from the May 2020 meeting.
 - Lisa introduced the meeting agenda and welcomed the committee members.

2. PowerPoint Presentation

- Lisa introduced the schedule of the projects.
- a. Questions/Comments related to May meeting
 - i. Review Comments on draft Community Engagement Plan
 - Noe reviewed comments received for the draft Community Engagement Plan. He discussed ways to interact with the community in a virtual setting as well as planning for when COVID restrictions are lifted.
 - Belinda asked if the logo and website will be reviewed by the committee members.
 - Eric noted that the logo and website will be presented to the committee.
 - ii. Review channel information
 - Tony discussed updates on channel information produced. He reminded the committee of how we have been collecting data over the last few months. The goal is to determine freeboard, depth, and freeboard every 100 feet to see which sections exceed the freeboard and become issues of concern. Next steps are to determine the necessary widths of the channels.
 - Debbie asked about channels like San Jose Creek that have a lot of midblock crossings. If you were to create an underground crossing for the bike path, would you be losing capacity and how would you approach that scenario?
 - Tony noted that underpass and overpass data has not been collected yet. The project notes that there would be 28 potential crossings and those conditions would be addressed.
 - Debbie asked if the soft bottom channel could also be similar to the irregular channel option to flood the walkway/access road.
 - Tony noted that it would be extremely difficult to do the irregular channel with a retain wall. There would still be a lot of space required which could cause the design to go outside of the right-of-way.
 - Dan recognized that this is an extremely important option to use natural channels, but all the factors must be considered.
- b. Introduce draft Project Prioritization Criteria
 - Jean introduced the study area and corridors that could lead to these possible greenways. She noted that these are data sets that we have found through other projects during the existing project study but are not finalized for this project.
 - **Flood Management Data Set**
 - Belinda noted that efforts are being coordinated with the Army Corps of Engineers.
 - Eric noted that we are looking for as-builts and public works does have records of flow from gauging stations throughout the County. Eric will reach out to other County members to obtain this data.
 - Debbie asked if the storage capacity from the WASC projects being calculated into this flood management studies?
 - Jean noted that it is not a dataset that we currently have but will do more research on it.
 - Debbie asked about the possibility of studying floodable access roads and trails.
 - **Community Data Set**
 - Debbie asked if the band below highway 60 will be considered in this project.
 - Johnathan noted 1/4 mile and 1/2 mile have become standards because these are the distances most people are found to be willing to walk.
 - Debbie noted that people would be willing to bike further.

- Edna asked if there is a reason that the San Gabriel River and connecting to that infrastructure isn't included on this map/analysis.
- Eric noted that existing projects are not shown in connection with this map, but will be considered in the project.
- Johnathan noted that this is a significant undertaking with dynamic challenges, and thank you for your work so far. Given that the original 2017 motion called for updates to the 2006 San Gabriel River Corridor Master Plan consistent with more recent planning efforts as well as work for the SGV Greenway Network, specifically addressing climate resilience (flood, heat, sediment movement, carbon sequestration) and the biodiversity crisis are significant elements that are relevant to address. Setting out to create a kit of parts would be a strong approach for addressing the motion and needs of such a wide-ranging initiative. Setting priorities for maximizing soil (carbon, air and water quality, water conservation, water capture [soil can hold 20x weight in water], cooling, biological integrity), appropriate plant material for management and target species (air and water quality, water conservation, cooling, biological integrity, aesthetics), establishing a consistent plant pallet (recommend Bart O'Brien's original draft list as a start), limiting lighting impacts, and signage and interpretation along with aesthetic and security elements are all recommendations.
- **Circulation Data Set**
- Debbie noted along highway 10 there is a gap to get to the wilderness areas. She asked if circulation also considering points to the river trails.
- Jean noted yes that is considered in the data sets.
- **Recreation Data Set**
- Debbie noted she recommend connecting with Puente Hills Habitat Authority who manages trails in the Puente Hills that with good connectivity could be a regional draw via the river corridors, same for foothill trails. Joint use of schools along the rivers can provide additional recreation. Equestrian uses should also be considered and location of stables and equestrian districts.
- **Water Data Set**
- Belinda noted that there will be Measure W projects that the team should watch review and consider as they come in Phase 1 and 2.
- Debbie asked if Is there an opportunity to review options for in channel uses and water quality related uses - Kayaking near San Jose Creek Confluence. There are also model plane uses in channel near City of Hope.
- Sally asks how IRWMPs are incorporated into the project.
- Lisa and Jean noted that EWMPs and IRWMPs were included in the planning study.
- Debbie asked if the super fund site being considered.
- Johnathan noted he strongly recommends use of 2017 NRCS Soils for any potential infiltration considerations, third-party field tests have demonstrated infiltration rates match well, and also reference to US Bureau of Rec and Public Works LA Basin Study: <https://www.usbr.gov/lc/social/basinstudies/LABasin.html>
- **Existing Projects Data Set**
- Lisa noted that this data set has been filled out in previous meetings.
- **Regulatory Data Set**
- Belinda noted it would be helpful to show what the maps are trying to connect to.

3. Next Steps

- a. Project Team to send meeting summary
- b. Committee feedback on the Draft Project Prioritization Criteria needed by July 1, 2020
- c. Future meeting dates
 - July 8, 2020, 2PM to 5PM
 - August 12, 2020, 2PM to 5PM
 - September 9, 2020, 2PM to 5PM

DRAFT