

# LOWER LOS ANGELES RIVER REVITALIZATION PLAN (LLARRP) WORKING GROUP MEETING #21

Thursday, January 4, 2018 ♦ 6:00 pm – 9:00 pm  
Auditorium Banquet Room, 4900 Southern Avenue, South Gate, CA 90201

---

## S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

---

### INTRODUCTION

On January 4, 2018, California State Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon of the 63<sup>rd</sup> Assembly District and the Rivers and Mountain Conservancy (RMC) co-hosted the twenty-first meeting of the Working Group for the Lower Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan (LLARRP). The purpose of the meeting was to: review final concepts and renderings of projects and templates; discuss proposed revisions to the Draft LLARRP document; and learn about the remaining steps in the planning process.

#### **Meeting Format and Agenda**

The twenty-first meeting of the Working Group occurred on January 4, 2018, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at Auditorium Banquet Room, 4900 Southern Avenue, South Gate. Approximately 30 Working Group members and 20 community members participated in the meeting (Attachment B).

Mark Stanley, Executive Officer of the RMC opened the meeting by welcoming attendees and explaining the purpose and objectives of the meeting. Daniel Iacofano of MIG, Inc., served as meeting facilitator and provided an overview of the agenda (Attachment A) and meeting format before asking for self-introductions from all participants. Project team members from Tetra Tech, Perkins + Will, and Studio MLA presented on the final concepts and renderings of projects and templates. Oliver Galang of Tetra Tech reviewed the main themes of public input received to-date on the Draft LLARRP, as well as the project team’s proposed revisions. Ira Artz of Tetra Tech reviewed the proposed revision to the governance/management structure, which Working Group members discussed in detail. Finally, Mr. Iacofano confirmed with each Working Group member her/his priority revisions to the Draft LLARRP to ensure their support for the Final LLARRP.

During each presentation, Mr. Iacofano facilitated discussions with Working Group members and other participants to address questions and comments. During these discussions, Andy Pendoley of MIG recorded key outcomes and discussion points on a wall-sized piece of paper, or “wallgraphic.” A summary of the discussion points is provided in the following sections, and a copy of the wallgraphic is included in the appendix to this report.

## FINAL CONCEPTS AND RENDERINGS

Project team members from Tetra Tech, Perkins + Will, and Studio MLA presented final concepts and renderings for the projects and templates. Following each presentation, Working Group members and audience members asked questions and provided comments, with project team responses in *italics*, as follows:

### ***Cudahy River Road***

- Avoid allowing public access to contaminated water to prevent health impacts. Currently, warning signage is inadequate along the corridor
- Improve water quality as a public health measure. Studies in the upper portions of the river show high levels of E. Coli. What is the prevalence in this part of the river? – *Typically, the levels are low at low water levels/flow, and higher at high levels/flow*
- Minimize public access to wildlife habitats to prevent domesticating animals
- How will public safety be addressed during high-flow periods? -- *The facility will continue to function as a flood control channel*
- Identifying a proposed mix-use designation at site #9 promotes land speculation and displacement. Why is this proposed to be mix-use? – The City of Cudahy identified is as a consideration and future opportunity as part of their community planning initiatives. Land use authority remains with the cities/jurisdictions along the corridor

### ***Willow Street***

- How will safety be ensured among multi-use trails and pathways (traffic, bicycle, pedestrian, equestrian)? – *The LLARRP includes complete street designs as templates, which will be applied and customized to each location's immediate surroundings, site geometry, existing users, anticipated future users, and other considerations*
- How will users connect to this location? – *The plan suggests creating new access points from local streets, as well as a potential trail on the west side of the river*
- Will funding through the LA Metro bicycle program contribute to this project? Maintaining coordination between that project and LLARRP is important. – *The project team remains in contact with LA Metro and is exploring this initiative as a possible funding source*
- How will floating bridges be constructed, and designed for earthquake safety? – *As these are currently concepts, in the future a detailed project design and engineering will address these points*

### ***Rio Hondo Confluence***

- Revise the red-dashed line to include the proposed MLK bridge
- Enhance the color richness of the shaded green spaces in the rendering

### ***Easements and Crossovers***

- Update the bridge identified at Coolidge
- Include the Art Center location
- Include the final renderings in the Final LLARRP
- Infuse more inviting and natural imagery that is realistic, including shade, greenery and activated spaces
  - Remove balloons from the renderings as they are unsafe as debris in the river and in contacting utility lines
- Identify the existing infrastructure in the utility corridor in the renderings and site plans
- Showcase the proposed programming in the renderings to highlight activated spaces

### ***Compton Creek Confluence***

- Did the project team analyze water flow impacts at the culvert? – *No, as there is less water volume at this location*
- Preserve the existing and proposed multi-use trail access and connection for Compton Creek

### ***Additional Issue Areas***

- Create design values for projects and templates that focus on human needs such as services and access, particularly for people who are homeless. Link to the recent LA County Board of Supervisors' motion to provide more support. – *The displacement and gentrification toolkit developed for the LLARRP includes multiple suggestions*
- Provide a diversity of commercial opportunities for local residents along the corridor
- Strengthen trail safety measures to address safety with shared use paths/trails and identify roles and responsibilities by agency
- Who will be responsible for law enforcement? – *New models are under consideration*
- Standing water is a threat to mosquito and vector control. How much stormwater is diverted into the river? – *The amount of flow depends on weather conditions*

### **PROPOSED REVISIONS TO DRAFT LLARRP**

Mr. Galang provided an overview of key themes of public input provided on the Draft LLARRP between the release date of December 7, 2017, to this meeting date. Working Group members provided comments with project team responses in *italics*, as follows:

- How will input on the new renderings provided during this meeting be reflected in the Final LLARRP? – *The project team is receiving all input during this meeting as part of*

*public input on the Draft LLARRP. Additional input is welcomed through the January 11, 2018 deadline.*

- Articulate the project goals and objectives in detail in Volume 1 as a reflection of their over-arching importance the LLARRP framework
- Place the Watershed Education Program in the front portion of the LLARRP
- Strengthen the prominence of displacement and gentrification toolkit and the economic development principles as they are essential to the Working Group.
  - Showcase the principles by describing how they may be applied in implementing each of the signature projects
  - Illustrate how jurisdictions and communities may benefit and may address impacts
  - Explain how 100% goal attainment can happen with research and implementation explanations
  - Develop design values to further direct implementation of projects in equitable and beneficial ways
  - Describe how varying components can be leveraged for mutual-benefits (e.g., funding sources for habitat enhancements contributing to river access)
- Identify a multi-pronged, sediment monitoring approach
- Minimize public access to contaminated water
- Identify funding sources and how they benefit communities
- Explain and justify risks to the community through these investments

## **GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE - REVISED**

Mr. Artz presented a revised structure for the Lower LA River Management Committee that illustrates the level of representation by participating agencies and jurisdictions, as well as public advisory and topical committees. Working Group members asked questions, with project team responses in *italics*, as follows:

- How would LA County be represented in this structure? – *The Flood Control District would serve in this role*
- Place public members on the Management Committee in a non-voting role to promote collaboration and focus on community needs
- Maintain a voting function for decisions to show levels of support and collaboration
- Avoid creating a community advisory group as a “pass-through” entity for community representation
- Define the necessary qualifications of committee members.

In lieu of confirming detailed and confirmed roles and expectations of the Management Committee Structure, Mr. Iacofano asked to Working Group members to contribute to identifying a framework and guidelines for continued deliberation about the structure. Working Group members identified the following points:

- Honor the vision, purpose and intention of AB530 and the LLARRP
- Develop a clear charge, purpose and mission
- Ensure sufficient representation of all community voices, including but not limited to: age groups, housing-status, jurisdictions and neighborhoods.
- Expand city/jurisdiction representation beyond one “seat”
- Entrust the community’s role to provide effective checks and balances
- Clarify the group as advisory in nature, and not a decision-making body

## **PRIORITY REVISIONS**

To conclude the meeting discussion on revisions to the Draft LLARRP, Mr. Iacofano asked each Working Group member to identify her/his organization’s priority revisions that must be included to gain their support of the Final LLARRP. Working Group members identified the following priority revisions as identified during the meeting:

- Elevate the goals, values and displacement toolkit to a higher prominence
- Define governance details and framework to address increased public representation, promote collaboration, define the Management Committee charge, and add design values
- Portray the equity principles through description of project and policy implementation
- Identify clear next steps about the engagement process after LLARRP adoption
- Remove language that suggests projects, plans or implementation ideas are “optional” as noted in the Community Stabilization Toolkit.
- Correct the naming of Avila/Kaboom Park
- Explain how reconciliation will occur between the LLARRP and LA River Master Plan Update
- Identify all existing infrastructure elements in plans and renderings
- Strengthen the resiliency of the river in low-flow conditions

## **NEXT STEPS**

Mr. Iacofano concluded the meeting by thanking Working Group members and reviewing upcoming milestones, including the following:

- All comments due: before 5:00 PM on January 11, 2018
- Revised Plan available for review: January 25, 2018
- Final Plan Discussion at Working Group # 22: February 1, 2018
- Working Group Meeting #22, February 1, 2018, (TBD)

Mr. Stanley highlighted concurrent and related initiatives that will be integral to LLARRP implementation, including the following:

- Proposition 1 funding opportunities
  - \$100 million RMC/SMMC
  - Planning and Implementation
- SB 5 funding opportunity
  - \$20 million CNRA
  - \$75 million RMC/SMMC
- River Ranger Study (AB1558)
  - Development of RR Program through collaboration with partners
  - By June 30, 2018
- Park District (SB 374)
  - Recreation and park district
  - By petition to LAFCO