

# LOWER LOS ANGELES RIVER REVITALIZATION PLAN (LLARRP) WORKING GROUP MEETING #18

Thursday, October 5, 2017 ♦ 6:00 pm – 9:00 pm  
Barbara Riley Auditorium, 7810 Quill Dr., Downey, CA 90242

---

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

---

### INTRODUCTION

On October 5, 2017, California State Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon of the 63<sup>rd</sup> Assembly District and the Rivers and Mountain Conservancy (RMC) co-hosted the eighteenth meeting of the Working Group for the Lower Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan (LLARRP). The purpose of the meeting was to: review proposed signature concepts for projects and templates for detailed analysis, finalize the alternative for the Rio Hondo Concept; and review the final draft outline for the Watershed Education Program.

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

The eighteenth meeting of the Working Group occurred on October 5, 2017, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Barbara Riley Auditorium, 7810 Quill Dr., Downey. Approximately 25 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. He provided updates regarding State legislation that will potentially provide resources for river revitalization. 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. Oliver Galang of Tetra Tech, part of the project team, presented the proposed signature concepts—four projects and two templates—for detailed analysis, which the Working Group unanimously endorsed. Mr. Galang then presented a set of final alternatives for the Rio Hondo Concept, which the Working Group opted to review in more detail outside of the meeting before recommending an alternative. Finally, Wendy Ramallo of the Council for Watershed Health delivered a presentation of the final draft outline for the Watershed Education Program for the 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.

## **SIGNATURE CONCEPTS: TEMPLATES AND PROJECTS**

Mr. Galang presented the proposed list of six signature concepts. He explained how the original 12 signature projects, templates and the community stabilization policy as selected by the Working Group advanced through feasibility analyses and review by the River Segment Committees. The analyses included field investigation, site constraints, configurations, preliminary cost estimates, hydraulic modeling, stream restoration input, and geotechnical. The evaluation criteria included that a project be predominantly within public ownership, included engaged partners/communities, and quick implementation opportunities. Leigh Christy of Perkins + Will presented the templates, and Mr. Galang presented the projects.

### ***Templates: Connectivity/Complete Streets and Wayfinding/Welcoming; Multi-Use Trail Enhancements***

Following Ms. Christy's presentation, Working Group members asked questions, with project team responses in *italics*, as follows:

- How are cultural and historic conditions—such as indigenous peoples—included in the templates? – *These are possible to consider depending upon the potential locations, local context, and histories.*
- How do the templates address the needs of separating users on pathways? -- *The template will provide standards by user type. Section diagrams will illustrate how to separate users in the designs.*

### ***Projects***

Following Mr. Galang's presentation on each of the following projects, Working Group members provided comments and asked questions, with project team responses in *italics*, as follows:

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

- Promote greenway connectivity from the park to the river and between neighborhoods and neighboring cities
- Plan for significant coordination among utility and State regulators for pipeline relocation underneath River Road
- Assess possible contamination in the parking area of Park Avenue Elementary School

#### **LA River South of Willow**

- Does the project expand existing natural areas? – *Yes.*
- A nearby service center for the homeless may be displaced by the I-710 Corridor Project, which may further exacerbate homeless encampments in this part of the river
- Increase the number of trees in the river to the extent possible. – *The Army Corps of Engineers will study the potential and advise on what's possible.*

- Address the existing collection areas of heavy sediment and debris, and the resulting water quality impacts
- Why was the length of this project shortened? – *The shorter will promote greater implementation potential.*
- Why was this project elevated above Compton Creek Confluence? – *That project offers less control of public infrastructure, resulting in less certainty about implementation potential and timing.*

### **Concrete Channel Enhancements**

- The current conditions of the low-flow channel are ineffective in some locations. Does this include improved design of the low flow channel? – *Yes, it includes correct sizing of the channel relative to flows at key locations.*
- Are the proposed enhancements to be placed on top of the existing structure on the floor of the river? – *Yes, as this will preserve the stability of the existing channel.*
- Consider adding more sculptural elements instead of faux-natural designs
- Verify the future of existing flow sources, and anticipate potential reductions in the long term. – *New flow sources are not being added, and a consistent flow rate is anticipated.*

### **Rio Hondo Confluence**

- What is the soft-bottom material in Configuration 3? – *Grasses.*
- How will construction occur among flow? – Construction would be phased to occur during dry weather.
- Is it possible to mix and match potential amenities? – *Yes.*
- Focus on providing a crossing at Martin Luther King Drive.
- Ensure the public space at the I-710-Imperial Highway location is for passive use, and mitigate emissions exposure
- Locate the proposed Amphitheatre at the confluence point, not to the side
- Integrate the proposed Lynwood bridge with the trail connection
- Include a multi-use trail on the east side of the river
- Provide clarity about the feasibility of Configuration 3 given the high cost.
- Locate parking lots away from the river edge.
- Where does the culver day-light? – *Approximately 1 mile south.*

### **Community Stabilization**

Some Working Group members expressed frustration and asked questions about why community stabilization policies are not included as part of the top six Signature Concepts. They expressed the importance of equity and stabilization having a prominent place in the LLARRP, serving as an “umbrella” over the LLARRP. Furthermore, they indicated that this policy framework should be implementation focused, and that the unintended consequences should be clearly explained.

### **Additional Analysis**

Some Working Group members asked for additional analysis, as follows:

- Articulate the templates and projects in more people/human-centric language and imagery
- Identify new or improved crossings more explicitly as part of projects
- Explain the rationale and scoring of the 12 Signature Concepts

### ***Watershed Education Program***

Following Ms. Ramallo's presentation on the final draft outline of the Watershed Education Program, Working Group members provided comments, as follows:

- Ensure the program is multi-lingual and immersion-ready for schools
- Recognize and integrate cultural and indigenous contexts
- Link the WEP to education standards, which makes it easier for educators to implement
- Link the WEP to scouting programs and achievements
- Provide to afterschool programs and clubs, which may be easier to support implementation

### **NEXT STEPS**

Mr. Iacofano concluded the meeting by thanking Working Group members and reviewing upcoming meeting dates and agendas, which are listed on the project website.

The next Working Group meetings are scheduled as follows:

- Thursday, November 2, 2017, (TBD)
- Thursday, December 7, 2017, (TBD)
- Thursday, January 4, 2017, (TBD)