

Prepared for: Los Angeles County Public Works

Project Title: San Gabriel Valley Greenway Network Strategic Implementation Plan

Project No.: 153937

Purpose of Meeting: April 2020 Steering Committee Kick-Off Meeting

Date: April 15, 2020

Meeting Location: Virtual via Teams

Time: 2:00 p.m.

See Microsoft Outlook Invite

Agenda Prepared by: Lisa Skutecki, Brown and Caldwell

Attendees:

- | | |
|--|--|
| Keith Lilley, LACPW | Belinda Faustinos, Nature For All |
| Carolina Hernandez, LACPW | Robin Mark, Trust For Public Land |
| Dan Sharp, LACPW | Andrew Ross, LACPW TPP |
| Enrique Baul, LACPW | Edna Robidas, Trust For Public Land |
| Jennifer Aborida, LACPW | Daritza Gonzalez, LAC SD4 (filling in for Jocelyn) |
| Lyndon Tat, LACPW | Julian Juarez |
| Lisa Skutecki, Brown and Caldwell | Loretta Quach, LACDPR |
| Rosey Jencks, Brown and Caldwell | Martin Reyes, LAC SD1 |
| Jesse Scolavino, Brown and Caldwell | Sally Gee, RMC (filling in for Mark Stanley) |
| Michelle O'Connor, LACDPR | Jan Dyer, Studio-MLA |
| Natasha Krakowiak, LACDPR | Kevin Johnson, Studio-MLA |
| Sheela Mathai, LACDPR | Jean Yang, Studio-MLA |
| Deborah Enos, WCA | Tony Howze, PACE |
| Johnathan Perisho, WCA | Cherise Thompson, PACE |
| Hannah Brunelle, SCAG | Mark Krebs, PACE |
| Katie Ward, SGVCOG | Carlos Velasquez, KOA |
| Elaine Kunitake, LACPW TPP | Dan Tormey, Catalyst |
| Norma Quinones, SGV Conservation Corps | Megan Schwartz, Catalyst |
| Wesley Reutimann, Active SGV | Esmeralda Garcia, MIG |
| Rudy Ortega, Native American Indian Commission | Noe Noyola, MIG |
| | Stephanie Lane Pavon, MIG |

Meeting Minutes

A meeting was held between the consulting team, the LACPW team, and various stakeholders listed above. A summary of the meeting is as follows:

1. Microsoft Teams Orientation
2. Introductions and welcoming remarks from Public Works

- a. Keith Lilley gave opening remarks regarding the current events and the San Gabriel Valley Greenway Network Strategic Implementation Plan.
- b. Participants introduced themselves using webcams, attendees are listed above.

3. PowerPoint Presentation

Lisa Skutecki the consultant Project Manager gave an overview of the project and reviewed the meeting agenda.

- a. Scope of Project
 - i. Lisa describes overview of project scope and each component.
 - ii. Project process is to analyze, prioritize, and guide Greenway development.
 - iii. Keeping the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in mind and want to include approved art into new projects.
 - iv. The conditions of the infrastructure and right-of-way will vary and will be assessed as part of the project's analysis.
 - v. Community engagement remains a high priority and will adapt to a virtual platform due to the current crisis.
 - vi. Belinda requested that the team use more SGV imagery in the presentation rather than Lower LA River. This sentiment is also held by Active SGV.
 - vii. Hannah asks: Does this plan include analysis of regional connectivity, or connections to local active transportation networks? She suggested that if the plan doesn't include this that the SCAG assist with this effort.
 - viii. Regional connectivity will be part of the prioritization process.
- b. Project Schedule
 - i. Lisa reviewed the schedule and noted the work under way, and what lays ahead.
 - ii. The project team will share a schedule of the next three to five-months with the STAC members after the meeting.
- c. Community Engagement
 - i. The engagement specialists on the team explained that community engagement will proceed while keeping in mind the need for social distancing.
 - ii. The goals for community engagement is to reach out to the community for their understanding and input.
 - iii. There is a three-phase engagement process which will help communities see how these greenways will improve the community.
 - iv. Martin asks: How are we connecting with community partnerships?
 - v. Esmeralda responds: Phone conversations with leaders of groups to identify how they communicate currently with members and planning how we will get materials to members that don't have technology easily accessible.
 - vi. Belinda: Nature For All has adopted a plan to pay constituents for their involvement.
 - vii. Next STAC meeting will be heavily focused on community engagement
- d. Task 3 Compilation of Studies
 - i. The team presented a map showing known projects in the area.
 - ii. Wes asks: Will this planning process include any actual project design? 30%, 60%? Many of the communities we work with have been asking for greenways for a decade or more,

- with sadly little progress in most places, with the exception of a few corridors (e.g., So Pasadena, Glendora, etc.)
- iii. Ten (10) conceptual designs will be created for the tributaries, but they will not be designed to 30%.
 - iv. Belinda asks: Did the research include the SGM and Watershed NPS Study and Metro Transit to Parks Strategic Plan?
 - v. Martin notes: I'd also like to request studying local jurisdiction active transportation plans to make sure we're maximizing connectivity.
 - vi. Lisa replied that the consultant team will look for these studies.
 - vii. The team will continue to use virtual participation by Stakeholder Committee members to address gaps.
 - viii. Kevin demonstrated how the STAC members can add comments and notes about missing projects, implemented projects, canceled projects, etc.
 - ix. Wes asks: How does the project team see this plan building upon – or complementing – rather than duplicating existing recent greenway planning efforts for the San Gabriel Valley?
 - x. Eric notes: Task 3 takes existing studies and includes them so we understand what plans are under way and will try to build on the SGVCOG Feasibility Study.
- e. Task 4 Update
- i. The project team shared a map displaying the compiled channel information.
 - ii. The team explained that we are collecting information about the channel slope, width, side slopes, top of banks, wall height, size of access roads.
 - iii. The team demonstrated the tool of compiled channel as-built information.
 - iv. Wes asks: Can someone please explain how the "safety parameters" are updated/determined? Is the County reassessing flood risk based on climate change models, an expectation for more extreme weather events in the future?
 - v. The safety parameters have not been updated in the LA County hydrology manual. We are using the same standard that we've had for some time. LACPW is partnering with UCLA to understand these changes but it will likely not be ready for this plan, however it is being looked at.
4. Next Steps
- a. Belinda asks: When will we be able to get access to this information?
 - b. A summary will be provided, but for now we can send the draft products to date for STAC members.
 - c. Carolina gives closing remarks.