

APPENDIX A

Photo Credits

Cover

San Gabriel Mountains: Courtesy of San Gabriel & Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy

Los Angeles River (at Long Beach): Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Ranger: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Cheryl Himmelstein, 1996

Beach: Courtesy of EIP Associates, 2001

Executive Summary

Los Angeles Satellite Image: Spaceshots, 1989

Los Angeles River at Elysian Park: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Bosque del Rio Hondo: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Lamb Studio, 1997

San Gabriel Mountains: Courtesy of Arthur Golding

Pan Pacific Park: Courtesy of EIP Associates

Arroyo Seco: Courtesy of Arthur Golding

Simi Hills: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Ranger: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Cheryl Himmelstein, 1996

Headwaters of the Los Angeles River: Courtesy Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Conceptual River Parkways: Courtesy of Montgomery Watson Harza, adapted from Spaceshots (1989)

Urban Riverfront Parcel (in Maywood): Courtesy of EIP Associates, 2001

Whittier Hills Trail: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tony Haig

Upper San Gabriel River Trail: Courtesy of Dan Slater, 2000-2001

Rio Hondo & Los Angeles River Confluence: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Legg Lake: Courtesy of Dan Slater, 2000-2001

Great Blue Heron: Courtesy of Dan Slater, 2000-2001

Trail Above Monrovia: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land

Los Angeles River: Courtesy of Arthur Golding

Chapter 1—Background

Los Angeles in 1873: Courtesy of Nevada Historical Society

San Gabriel in 1893: Courtesy of Historic Urban Plans

Los Angeles River south of Downtown: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Los Angeles River west of Sepulveda Dam: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Confluence of Arroyo Seco and Los Angeles River: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Chapter 2—Current Conditions

Upper Arroyo Seco: Courtesy of David Van Norman

Steelhead Trout caught by Leonard G. Hogue in January 1940: Courtesy of James N. Hogue

Arundo Removal near Whittier Narrows: Courtesy of Dan Horan

Chapter 3—A Vision for the Future

No Dumping Stencil: Courtesy of Heal the Bay

Ranger: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Cheryl Himmelstein, 1996

Interpretive Signage: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land

Children with Earth Ball: Courtesy of Tree People, Melinda F. Kelley

(Golden Gate) Park: Courtesy of EIP Associates

Pan Pacific Park: Courtesy of EIP Associates

Surplus LADWP Property: Courtesy of EIP Associates, 2001

Legg Lake: Courtesy of Dan Slater, 2000-2001

Los Angeles River at Sepulveda Basin: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Maywood Riverfront Park: Courtesy of EIP Associates, 2001

Existing Quarry in Irwindale: Courtesy of Arthur Golding

San Gabriel Mountains (Mountains, Hills, & Foothills): Courtesy of Arthur Golding

Arroyo Seco: Courtesy of Arthur Golding

San Gabriel River Trail: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Tree Planting Along Los Angeles River: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tony Haig, 1997

El Dorado Park in Long Beach: Courtesy of Dan Slater, 2000-2001

San Gabriel Mountains (Habitat and Linkages): Courtesy of Arthur Golding

Riparian Habitat Along Los Angeles River: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1997

Suburban Backyard: Courtesy of San Gabriel & Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy

Cogswell Dam: Courtesy of Dan Slater, 2000-2001

(Bridge over) Los Angeles River: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, Tom Lamb, 1996

Tujunga Wash: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land

Stormwater Retention Structure: Courtesy of Tree People

Upper San Gabriel River Canyon: Courtesy of Trust for Public Land, J. Danza

Arroyo Seco: Courtesy of Arthur Golding

APPENDIX B

Acronyms

BMPs	Best Management Practices
CREEC-LA	California Regional Environmental Educational Center—Los Angeles
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GLOBE	Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment
GREEN	Global Rivers Environmental Education Network
LACDA	Los Angeles County Drainage Area
LACDPW	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LARWQCB	Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
MRCA	Mountains Recreation Conservation Authority
NAAEE	North American Association of Environmental Educators
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
RMC	Lower Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and Mountains Conservancy
SEAs	Significant Ecological Areas
SMMC	Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TPL	Trust for Public Lands
TREES	Trans-agency Resources for Economic and Environmental Sustainability
ULARA	Upper Los Angeles River Area
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirements
WET	Water Education for Teachers

APPENDIX C

Glossary of Useful Terms

(Derived from the *Second Nature* report prepared by Tree People, and *Stormwater: Asset Not Liability*, by Dallman and Piechota)

50-year storm—The L.A. County Department of Public Works capital flood hydrology is based on design storm derived from 50-year return frequency, based on historical weather data in the Los Angeles region. This design event occurs over a four-day period, with the maximum rainfall falling on the fourth day.

133-year storm—The storm intensity used by the Army Corps of Engineers for calculating flood likelihood. Presumably a storm of this intensity occurs once every 133 years on average.

Aeration—A process whereby air voids are introduced into soil for improved fertility and water holding capability.

Base flow of streams—Water slowly percolates underground and then spreads laterally until it reaches the surface (not pumped up) becoming part of the natural flow in rivers and streams, its base flow. This seeping ground water is what maintains the flow in a river due to the return flow of groundwater.

Bio-remediate—Bio-remediation uses biological processes to repair pollution damage. For example, a grass swale can bio-remediate much of the pollution caused by automobile use by holding heavy metals in the soil at harmless concentrations as well as by the action of soil bacteria, which gradually breaks down hydrocarbon waste such as crankcase oil.

Beneficial uses—historical, existing or potential uses of a body of water. The Regional Water Quality Control Boards designate uses for individual bodies of water, with the intent of preserving or restoring those uses. There are 24 beneficial uses designations in California, including wildlife habitat, industrial processes, agricultural supply, and ground water recharge.

Catchment planter—A planting bed that has been specially designed to hold and absorb storm flows from adjacent areas, usually from parking lots.

Cistern—Storage tank built either above or below ground or on a roof to store water for later use: for irrigation, fire fighting, and in some countries, for drinking and bathing.

Compost—Decaying vegetation. Can be used as ground cover or mulch, and as fertilizer.

Design storm—The size of a storm, defined by duration, intensity, and amount of precipitation, that storm drain systems are designed to accommodate. As development paves over the land, increasing the volume of runoff, the design capacity of built storm drains can become inadequate.

Detention basin—Temporary storage to reduce the peak flow, but not the total volume of storm water during a storm.

Debris basin—Facility constructed to contain debris flows (water, rocks, mud, sediment vegetation and other debris) that occur during major storm events, particularly in areas that have been subject to wildfires.

Drainage chimney—Holes drilled into the ground sufficiently deep to allow rainwater to quickly flow back into the ground. Also known as a dry well.

Drainage flow deflector—A ridge and/or a depression in a flat paved surface for the purpose of re-directing sheet flow into a channel, thus changing the destination of storm water.

Dry flow—The continuous flow in a storm drain system that occurs even during extended periods without rain.

Dry well—A constructed well designed to receive water for groundwater recharge.

Evapotranspiration—The loss of water from the soil both by evaporation and by transpiration from the plants growing thereon.

Filter medium—Any item or substance that is used for filtering impurities. Soil, sand, and mulch are used as a filter media.

First-flush rain—In the Los Angeles area, many months can pass between one rainstorm and the next. During this time, pollution and grime build up on all of the city’s outdoor surfaces, and in particular, on its streets. When the next rainstorm finally comes, it washes the accumulated grime and pollution off of the streets and into the underground storm drain system. This is the “first flush rain.” As you might expect, it carries a very large amount of suspended and dissolved pollutants.

Flood plain—The lands next to rivers and streams that flood naturally during large storm events. The flood plain’s function is to store sediment and flood flows.

Grass filter strips—A grassy edge or swale that filters storm water in the root layer before percolating the water into the soil below or discharging the water overland.

Graywater—Water drained from household sinks, washers, tubs, and showers—that is, all water not coming from toilets. This water carries relatively few suspended or dissolved solids. Consequently, it can often be used for such purposes as landscape irrigation.

Green filter islands—A grassy or planted landscaped island, usually in a parking lot, that filters storm water in the root layer before percolating the water into the soil below or discharging the water overland.

Green link—Green links connect various locations via generously planted “park- like” linear corridors.

Groundwater—The water that collects and is stored underground into basins defined by the underlying geology. The level of groundwater or “water table” varies according to the type of soil and underlying geologic formations, and from season to season. In rare instances, and on particular sites, the groundwater table comes up to the surface. This results in standing water on the surface of the ground. More often, the groundwater table is located many feet below the surface.

Groundwater mounding—In certain instances, where stormwater is returned to the soil in one location at a faster rate than in adjacent locations, groundwater mounding can occur. This means that the water table (where the soil is saturated) can be higher under a recharge basin than in adjacent locations. Occasionally this can create problems. Often it is benign.

Groundwater recharge—Surface water that filters into the ground and reaches underground reservoirs, providing replenishment and/or increased storage for groundwater basins. This occurs naturally during and after rainstorms, in creek beds with flowing water, or can be accomplished purposefully by directing storm water into specially prepared recharge areas for infiltration.

Heat gain—Heat can slowly build up in an object over time. This is called heat gain. In a building, heat gain is most often the consequence of many hours of sunshine striking and warming the exterior walls and roof.

Heat island effect—Many urban areas lack shade trees. In these areas the sun strikes pavement and rooftops, heating them to very high temperatures. These surfaces re-radiate heat back into the air, raising air

temperatures by five or more degrees. Urban areas that contain dense tree canopy avoid the heat island effect because trees absorb virtually all of the sun's energy without radiating heat back into the air.

High crowns—Virtually all roads and parking areas have some kind of crown, or high point, to insure that water flows off promptly. Usually this high point is a ridge along the center line of the road or parking bay. This ridge is ordinarily only a few inches higher than the edges. “High crown” suggests a condition where this crown is made artificially higher to allow the road or bay to hold more water than it otherwise could.

Holding pond—A depression where rainwater is directed and held temporarily. Holding ponds function to slow the rate at which water is discharged from a site to the rate more typical of undeveloped natural sites.

Humus layer—The top layer of soil where there is the most organic activity, fibrous root material, and recycling detritus from the plants above.

Hundred-year storm—There is a 1 in 100 chance of a storm of this magnitude happening in any one year. Flood flow rates from hundred year storms are recalculated over time due to changes in the landscape (e.g., increased urbanization).

Hydrology—The occurrence, distribution, movement, and properties of water above and below the earth's surface. The natural hydrology of an area may be significantly altered by catastrophic events (earthquakes, landslides) and by human development (agriculture, urbanization).

Impervious or impermeable—A surface that does not allow the passage of water and thus potentially facilitates the generation of runoff.

Infiltration—The process by which water moves downward through the earth's surface, replenishing soil moisture and groundwater basins. The ability of the soil to infiltrate water depends on many factors, including the nature of the surface cover, and soil characteristics such as texture and depth.

Infiltration zone—An area particularly well suited and/or altered for directing storm water back into the soil.

Mulch—Organic material placed on the ground, sometimes many inches thick, used as a ground cover to cool the soil, discourage weeds and erosion, aid in the infiltration of water, minimize the heat island effect of the city, and reduce the costs of green waste disposal.

Natural flood plain—Every river or stream naturally overflows its low flow or non-storm capacity channel during major storm events. Flood plains consist of those areas that would naturally flood during major storms. Their function is to disperse sediments and to infiltrate water underground.

Percolation—The act of water soaking into the ground. This term is used most frequently in conjunction with spreading grounds, where water is purposefully allowed to percolate through the soil to the groundwater.

Percolation basin—An above ground storage place—retention basin—built so as to encourage the percolation of water contained therein underground.

Percolation rate—The rate at which water filters into the soil. Some soil types, such as sand, have a very high percolation rate; other soils types, such as clay, have a very slow percolation rate.

Permeable pavement—Permeable pavement is honeycombed with voids, or air pockets. These voids allow water to migrate down through the pavement into the soil below.

Pervious or permeable surfaces—Surfaces that allow water or other liquids to penetrate and potentially reach the ground (depending on the thickness of the surface, how porous it is, and the amount of water).

Porosity—A measure of the ability of water to pass through a material, which is dependent upon how much empty space occurs between the particles that make up the substance. For example, sand is much more porous than clay.

Potable water—Water that is fit to drink.

Precipitation—Rain, hail or snow that falls from the atmosphere.

Recharge areas—Certain zones in the landscape can accept water back into the soil at higher than average rates. Such areas are often referred to as recharge areas.

Residential density—The number of family units to be found on an average acre of land in a residential area is referred to as its density. These densities range from low (1-2 units per acre) to high (40 + units per acre).

Retention basin or infiltration basin—Stores water with the purpose of reducing the volume of runoff by capturing precipitation and surface runoff for recharge to groundwater. These basins do not return captured runoff to storm water channels.

Return period—The average recurrence of a storm of a particular size and duration.

Riparian habitat—Habitat next to rivers or streams and dependent on the additional moisture in the river. Its function is to provide food and shelter for many creatures, to reduce the volume and velocity of runoff, and increase infiltration.

Riparian retention and treatment area—A retention or recharge area where plants native to rivers or lakes are installed to consume and clean the water therein.

Riprap—A rock lining used to stabilize sloping stream banks.

River corridor—Includes the river, the flood plain, the riparian trees, and plants that grow in the high groundwater and most soils along the way.

Runoff—Stormwater that flows off of one surface or site onto another.

Sheet flow—Stormwater that flows in even sheets across a flat surface, such as a parking lot.

Spreading grounds—A land area specifically designed to be flooded so that the water will percolate or soak into the ground, recharging the ground water.

Stormwater—Refers to all rainwater that hits the surface of the ground. Stormwater either percolates back into the soil or flows on the surface to the nearest storm drain inlet, stream, or other wetland area.

Subsoil—the soil layer below the “topsoil” layer.

Subsurface—Below the surface of the ground.

Sustainability—The ability to meet current needs without compromising the ability of future generations to do the same. Also, the goal of securing life, liberty, and social well-being within the means of nature.

Swale—A v-shaped depression in the land, usually lined with grass, designed as a channel for moving storm water from one place to another.

Velocity of flow—How quickly the stormwater flows over the surface or through the storm drain system to the ocean. Velocity is determined by the design of the conveyance system: how wide, how smooth or rough, and the slope of the conveyance.

Water conservation—Means different things in different contexts. Usually, it means using less (consumer or farmer or landscape) due to hardware or management strategies. In the storm water management context, it means storing water in retention basins or behind a dam for infiltration to the ground water, making the water available as an addition to the drinking water supply.

Watershed—A region or area bound peripherally by a divide or ridge, all of which drains to a particular watercourse or body of water. Most urban sites are now mini-watersheds, with the property line constituting the “ridge” and the storm drain system located in the street constituting the “watercourse” to which it discharges.

APPENDIX D

References

CHAPTER 1—Background

- California Coastal Conservancy, *Wetlands of the Los Angeles River, Profiles and Restoration Opportunities*, Coastal Conservancy, 2000
- Hise, Greg, William Deverell, Laurie Olin, *Eden by Design: The 1930 Olmstead-Bartholomew Regional Plan for the Los Angeles Region*, University of California Press, 2000
- Gumprecht, Blake, *The Los Angeles River: Its Life, Death and Possible Rebirth*, Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1999
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, *Los Angeles River Bikeway, Report for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors*, June 2001
- Olmsted Brothers and Bartholomew Associates, *Parks, Playgrounds and Beaches for the Los Angeles Region*, report submitted to the Citizens' Committee on Parks, Playgrounds and Beaches, 1930
- Shapiro, Erik A. and Leo J. Shapiro, *Making More Open Space – Making Space More Open in the Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River Watershed*, LJS Group and Leo J. Shapiro & Associates, April 6, 2001

CHAPTER 2—Current Conditions

- Aldrich, John H. and Meadows, Myra, *Southland Weather Handbook* Los Angeles: Brewster Publications, 1966
- Association of Groundwater Agencies, *Groundwater and Surface Water in Southern California: A Guide to Conjunctive Use* Montgomery Watson, Pasadena, California, 2000
- Blomquist, W., *Dividing the Waters*, San Francisco: ICS Press, 1992
- Brown, J., Delgado, D., Stevens, J. and Sung, K., *Reconnecting the San Gabriel Valley: A Planning Approach for the Creation of Interconnected Urban Wildlife Corridor Networks*. Pomona: California State Polytechnical University, Department of Landscape Architecture, June 2000
- California Coastal Conservancy, *Wetlands of the Los Angeles River Watershed: Profiles and Restoration Opportunities*, May 2000
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, *A Compilation of Water Quality Goals*, August 2000
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, *Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties*, adopted June 1994
- _____, *Los Angeles River Watershed Water Quality Characterization*, April, 1998
- _____, Resolution No. 98-018, *Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan to Incorporate Changes in Beneficial Use Designations for Selected Waters*, November 1998
- _____, *Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for Los Angeles County and Cities in Los Angeles County*, March 8, 2000
- _____, *State of the Watershed – Report on Surface Water Quality, The San Gabriel River Watershed*, June 2000

- _____, *Watershed Management Initiative Chapter*, December 2000
- _____, *Total Trash Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Los Angeles River Watershed*, January 25, 2001
- Central and West Basin Water Replenishment District, *Annual Survey Report on Ground Water Replenishment*, Bookman-Edmonston Engineering, Glendale, California, 1991
- Cook, Jody, Angeles Forest Supervisor, presentation at Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council conference *Habitat: Past, Present and Future*, May 2001
- Dallman, Suzanne and Piechota, Tom, *Stormwater: Asset Not Liability*, Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council, 1999.
- Gumprecht, Blake, *The Los Angeles River: Its Life, Death and Possible Rebirth*, Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1999
- Kreissman, Bern, *California: An Environmental Atlas and Guide*, Davis, CA: Bear Klaw Press, 1991
- Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council, *Water Supply and Management in the Los Angeles Area*, Draft, September 2001
- Mayer, Kenneth E. and Laudenslayer, William F., editors, *A Guide to the Wildlife Habitats of California*, Sacramento: State of California, 1988
- McPhee, John, *The Control of Nature*, New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1991
- Orme, Antony R. and Brown, Amalie Jo, *The Transverse Ranges and the San Andreas Fault System*, Los Angeles: International Conference of Historical Geographers, 1979
- PCR Services Corporation, Frank Hovore & Associates and FORMA Systems, *Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Area Update Study 2000*, report prepared for the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, November 2000
- Rairdan, Charles *Regional Restoration Goals in the Greater Los Angeles Drainage Area: A Landscape-Level Comparison of Recent Historic and Current Conditions Using Geographic Information Systems*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1998.
- San Gabriel Valley Water Association, *Water Issues*, Monrovia, California, Winter 1992
- San Gabriel River Watermaster, *Thirty-Fourth Annual Report of the San Gabriel River Watermaster for 1996-1997*, February 28, 1998
- Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and Water Replenishment District of Southern California, *Montebello Forebay Groundwater Recharge Engineering Report*, November 1997
- Shuit, Douglas P, "County Bike Lanes Going on Fast Track," *Los Angeles Times*, May 27, 2001
- Southern California Association of Governments, *Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide*, 1996
- Stephenson, John R. and Calcarone, Gena M, *Southern California Mountains and Foothills Assessment: Habitat and Species Conservation Issues*, Albany, CA: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, 1999
- Strahler A. H. and Strahler A. N, *Modern Physical Geography*, Fourth Edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1992

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, *Los Angeles County Drainage Area Review: Final Feasibility Study Interim Report and Environmental Impact Statement*, January 1992

■ Websites

Angeles National Forest—<http://www.r5.fs.fed.us/angeles/>

California Noxious Weed Control Projects Inventory—<http://endeavor.des.ucdavis.edu/weeds/>

California Wetlands Information System—
http://ceres.ca.gov/wetlands/geo_info/so_cal/los_angeles_river.html

EPA Surf Your Watershed—<http://www.epa.gov/surf3>

EPA Impaired Water Bodies—http://www.epa.gov/iwi/303d/18070105_303d.html, and
http://www.epa.gov/iwi/303d/18070106_303d.html

Los Angeles Almanac—<http://www.losangelesalmanac.com/>

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydrologic Annual Reports—
<http://dpw.co.la.ca.us/wrd/report/index.cfm>

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power—<http://www5.dwp.ci.la.ca.us/water/supply/facts/index.htm>

Metropolitan Water District—
<http://www.mwd.dst.ca.us/Docs/WaterReliability/Water4SoCal/waterforsocal.htm>

Orange County Environmental Management—<http://www.oc.ca.gov/pfrd/envres/stormwater/index.htm>

State Water Resources Control Board—<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/>

Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board—<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb4>

US Census Bureau, 2000 Census—<http://www.census.gov>

Western Regional Climate Data Center—<http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/summary/climsmca.html>

CHAPTER 3—A Vision for the Future

■ Guiding Principles

City of Huntington Beach, *Environmental Checklist Form Per CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, as Amended*, January 1, 2000

City of Long Beach, *Long Beach 2010 Strategic Plan*, 2000

City of Santa Monica, *Santa Monica Sustainable City Program*, 1994

Condon, Patrick and Moriarty, Stacy, Eds, *Second Nature: adapting LA's Landscape for Sustainable Living*, TreePeople, 1999

Dallman, Suzanne and Piechota, Tom, *Stormwater: Asset Not Liability*, Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council, 1999

Drennan, Michael, *A Summary of Guiding Principles for Successful Watershed Management Programs*, Montgomery Watson, 1998

- Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council, *Draft Scope of Work for a Los Angeles River Watershed Management Feasibility Study* (Later known as the Corps/County 3-Year Watercourse Study), 1996
- Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council, *Long Term Watershed Goals, Five-Year Strategic Plan*, 1997
- Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council, *Los Angeles - San Gabriel Watershed Vision: 2025*, 1998
- Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, *Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Area Update Study 2000*, November, 2000
- Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Parks and Recreation and Regional Planning, *Los Angeles River Master Plan*, 1996
- Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, *Water Quality Control Plan: Los Angeles Region Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties*, 1994
- Lynch, Kevin, *Good City Form*, MIT Press 1981
- Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority, *Guiding Principles* (Outline), *Request for Qualifications*, San Gabriel & Los Angeles Rivers Guiding Principles and Open Space Plan, 2001
- National Research Council Committee on Watershed Management, *New Strategies for America's Watersheds*, National Academy Press, 1999
- North East Trees and Arroyo Seco Foundation, *Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study: Goals and Objectives*, 2001
- PCR Services Corporation, *Executive Summary of the Proposed Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas*, 2000
- San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, *Conservancy Mission, Purposes, and Requirements*, 2001
- Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, *SAWPA's Plan for Clean Reliable Water for the Santa Ana River Watershed*, 2000
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, *Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy Strategic Plan: Mission Statement*, 1997
- Schueler, Thomas, *Crafting Better Urban Watershed Protection Plans*, Center for Watershed Protection, 1996
- Southern California Studies Center, *Sprawl Hits the Wall*, University of Southern California, 2001
- State of California, *California Public Resources Code, Section 32600 et seq* (Enabling Legislation, Rivers and Mountains Conservancy), 2000

■ Strategies, Opportunities, and Next Steps

- Brown, J., Delgado, D., Stevens, J. and Sung, K., *Reconnecting the San Gabriel Valley: A Planned Approach for the Creation of Interconnected Urban Wildlife Corridor Networks*. Pomona: California State Polytechnical University, Department of Landscape Architecture, June 2000
- California Coastal Conservancy, *Wetlands of the Los Angeles River Watershed: Profiles and Restoration Opportunities*, May 2000
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control, *Brownfields Initiatives Fact Sheet*, March 1998
- California Integrated Waste Management Board, California Materials Exchange, Creative Reuse, *The Green Bank, Good for the Air, Neighborhoods, and the Landfill*, Fall 2000

- California State Water Resources Control Board, Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program, *Opportunity, Responsibility, Accountability*, January 2001
- _____, *Water Quality Planning and Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Programs, Request for Proposals*, March 2001
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, *Draft Trash Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Los Angeles River Watershed*, January 22, 2001
- California Wilderness Coalition, *California Wildlands Project: A Vision for Wild California, Draft South Coast Regional Report*, Undated
- California Wilderness Coalition and The Nature Conservancy of California, *Missing Linkages, Restoring Connectivity to the California Landscape*, November, 2, 2000
- CALFED Bay-Delta Program, *Annual Report*, 2000
- _____, *Watershed Program Plan, Final Program EIS/EIR Technical Appendix*, July 2000
- Delorme Mapping Company, *Southern and Central California Atlas and Gazetteer*, 1990.
- Environmental Law Institute, *A Guidebook for Brownfield Property Owners*, 1999
- Forma Systems, *Open Space Plan, Phase One: Information Gathering, San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy*, Final Report, March 23, 2001
- Los Angeles City, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Stormwater Program, *Development Best Management Practices Handbook, Part B, Planning Activities*, February 15, 2001
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, *Los Angeles River Master Plan*, 1996
- Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council, *Beneficial Uses of the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers*, 2001
- National Wildlife Federation, *Paving Paradise, Sprawl's Impact on Wildlife and Wild Places in California, A Smart Growth and Wildlife Campaign California White Paper*, February 2001
- Noss, Reed, *Task 2: Assessment of the Feasibility of Wildlife Corridors, List of Species to be Addressed, Recommendations of Habitat Enhancement Opportunities for Migratory Birds and for Additional Information to be Collected, and Map of Corridor Opportunities. Report to the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council*, September 3, 2001
- Olmsted Brothers and Bartholomew Associates, *Parks, Playgrounds and Beaches for the Los Angeles Region*, report submitted to the Citizens' Committee on Parks, Playgrounds and Beaches, 1930
- Pasadena Star-News, San Gabriel Valley Tribune and the Whittier Daily News, *The San Gabriel, a River on the Edge*, A Special Report by the Pasadena Star-News, August 27, 2000.
- Pollack, Daniel, *Natural Community Conservation Planning, The Origins of an Ambitious Program to Protect Ecosystems*, March, 2001
- _____, *The Future of Habitat Conservation? The NCCP Experience in Southern California*, June, 2001
- Shapiro, Erik A. and Leo. J. Shapiro, *Making More Open Space – Making Space More Open in the Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River Watershed*, LJS Group and Leo J. Shapiro & Associates, April 6, 2001
- Thomas Brothers Mapping, *The Thomas Guide 2001 – Los Angeles and Orange Counties*, 2001
- United States Environmental Protection Agency, *San Gabriel Valley Superfund Sites Update*, July 1999

_____, *Promoting Environmental Justice Through Pollution Prevention*, September 2000

_____, *Our Built and Natural Environments. A Technical Review of the Interactions between Land Use, Transportation, and Environmental Quality*, September 2000

United States National Park Service, Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance, *Economic Impact of Protecting Rivers, Trails and Greenway Corridors*, 1995

■ Education-Related Websites

California Environmental Education—<http://ceres.ca.gov/education/>

California Regional Environmental Educational Center—Los Angeles—<http://www.creec.org/region11/>

Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment—
<http://www.centerx.gseis.ucla.edu/globe/index.htm>

Global Rivers Environmental Education Network—<http://www.igc.org/green/resources.html>

EcoAcademy (of the Los Angeles Conservation Corps)—<http://www.ecoacademy.org/>

National Wildlife Federation's backyard habitat program—<http://www.nwf.org/habitats/index.html>

North American Association of Environmental Educators—<http://www.naaee.org/>

Tree People—<http://www.treepeople.org/trees/>

US EPA's Water Office Kid's Page—<http://www.epa.gov/ow/kids/watered2.html>

Water Education for Teachers project—<http://www.water-ed.org/projectwet.asp>

■ Websites (used in preparation of the plan)

California Biodiversity Council—<http://ceres.ca.gov/biodiv/>

California Department of Fish and Game—<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/>

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection—<http://www.fire.ca.gov/>

California Department of Parks and Recreation—<http://parks.ca.gov/homepage/default.asp>

California Department of Toxic Substances Control—<http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/index.html>

California Department of Transportation—<http://www.dot.ca.gov/>

California Department of Water Resources—<http://www.dwr.water.ca.gov/>

California Environmental Resources Evaluation System—<http://ceres.ca.gov/index.html>

California Land Use Planning Information Network—<http://ceres.ca.gov/planning/>

California Native Plant Society—<http://www.cnps.org/>

California North Coast Watershed Assessment Program—<http://www.ncwatershed.ca.gov/>

California Ocean and Coastal Environmental Access Network (Cal Ocean) —<http://ceres.ca.gov/ocean/>

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region—
<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb4/index.html>

California Resources Agency—<http://ceres.ca.gov/cra/>

California State Coastal Conservancy—<http://www.coastalconservancy.ca.gov/>

California Watershed Information Technical System—<http://ceres.ca.gov/watershed/>

California Wetlands Information System—<http://ceres.ca.gov/wetlands/>

California Wildlife Conservation Board—<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wcb/index.html>

Facility City, “Growing Smart”—http://facilitycity.com/fc_exp_01_05_cover.asp

Gateway Cities Council of Governments—<http://www.gatewaycog.org/>

Hacienda Hills Open Space Research Studies—<http://ceres.ca.gov/hacinat.htm>

League of California Cities, Orange County Division—<http://www.occities.org/>

Know Your Watershed, Purdue University Conservation Information Technology Center—
<http://www.ctic.purdue.edu/KYW/>

Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council—<http://www.lasgriverswatershed.org/>

Los Angeles City Stormwater Program—www.lastormwater.org

Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation—<http://parks.co.la.ca.us/>

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Watershed Management Division—
<http://dpw.co.la.ca.us/wmd/>

Orange County Watershed Management Programs—<http://www.oc.ca.gov/pfrd/envres/watershed/>

San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy—<http://www.sgmrc.org/conserva.htm>

San Gabriel River Master Plan—http://dwp.co.la.ca.us/pln/sgrmp/files/m11151999.cfm?cal_id=138

San Gabriel River Trail—<http://www.nearfield.com/~dan/sports/bike/sg/index.htm>

San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments—<http://www.sgvkog.org/>

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board—<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb8/>

Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy—<http://www.smmc.ca.gov/>

Save the Whittier Hills 2000—<http://www.geocities.com/whittierhills/history.html>

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles Region—<http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/>

United States Forest Service, Angeles National Forest—<http://www.r5.fs.fed.us/angeles/>

United States National Park Service—<http://www.nps.gov/>

The Wildlands Conservancy—<http://www.wildlandsconservancy.org/>

APPENDIX E

RMC Project Authority

Attorney General's Office Opinion
Draft Approval Resolution

LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

Public: (213) 897-2000
Telephone: (213) 897-2706
Facsimile: (213) 897-2801
E-Mail: terry.fujimoto@doj.ca.gov

July 1, 2001

Mary A. Angle
Executive Director
San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles River
and Mountains Conservancy
900 South Fremont Avenue, 11th Floor
P.O. Box 1460
Alhambra, CA 91802-1460

RE: Request for Informal Advice re Open Space Plan

Dear Executive Officer Angle:

In a letter dated April 13, 2001, you requested that the Office of the Attorney General provide informal advice regarding the impact of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy's ("RMC") adoption of a San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Parkway and Open Space Plan ("OSP"). (Pub. Resources Code, § 32604 (d).) The purpose of this letter is to provide that informal advice.

ISSUES PRESENTED

Specifically, you asked the following two questions: first, you inquired whether it is necessary to comply with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") in the process of developing and adopting the OSP. Second, you asked our office to evaluate the effect of the adoption of the OSP, on the region, individual cities and affected landowners. In particular, you inquire whether approval of the OSP will require the member cities to amend their general plans to conform to the OSP, and/or give the RMC regulatory or governing authority over its member cities or over any ordinance, general or specific plan enacted by any local jurisdiction within its territory.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. As discussed below, while we conclude that the RMC must comply with CEQA in adopting the OSP, CEQA does not require the preparation of an environmental impact report or a negative declaration. Under CEQA, an agency must first determine whether the proposed activity is exempt or not a project within the meaning of CEQA. If it is determined that the action is exempt or a "non-project," no further review under CEQA is necessary. The OSP, as proposed, is not a "project" within the meaning of CEQA and therefore is not subject to further environmental review. We caution that implementation or amendment of the OSP may require additional review under CEQA including preparation of an environmental impact report.

2. The legislation establishing the RMC was enacted in response to the interest of the member cities in creating a multi-jurisdictional agency that would be authorized to acquire land,

and conduct watershed management, flood control, and recreational projects within the lower Los Angeles River and its tributaries, the San Gabriel River watershed and the San Gabriel Mountains. The cities, however, expressed concern that the new state agency not be empowered to usurp regulatory or governing control from the local entities. The legislation addresses that concern. First, the RMC does not possess the power of eminent domain. (See Public Res. Code, §§ 32612 (b), 32613 (b).) Second, the RMC has no regulatory or governing authority over any ordinance, general plan or other laws adopted by the local jurisdictions within its territory. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 32613 (b).) Finally, we note that there is no explicit requirement in the legislation that the member cities amend their general or regional plans to conform to the OSP. Certainly, if the Legislature had intended to impose such a significant requirement upon the affected cities it would have made it explicit, particularly where such a requirement is inconsistent with the principal directive that local entities retain authority over their own general and specific plans. Therefore, it is our view that adoption of the OSP will not require the individual cities or regional agencies to amend or alter their general or regional plans. Nor will the OSP give the RMC governing authority over its member cities or over any land use regulation or ordinance enacted by any local jurisdiction within its territory.

THE RMC AND APPROVAL OF THE OPEN SPACE PLAN

In 1999, the Legislature enacted the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy Act (Act), which added Division 22.8 to the Public Resources Code, beginning with section 32600. The Act created the RMC and specified that its principal purposes are to “acquire and manage public lands within the Lower Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River watersheds, and to provide open space, low impact recreational and educational uses, water conservation, water shed improvement, wildlife and habitat restoration and protection, and watershed improvement within the territory,” and to provide for public enjoyment in these watersheds and the San Gabriel Mountains. (Pub. Resources Code, § 32602 (a) and (d).)

Under Public Resources Code section 32604(d), the RMC “shall” prepare an OSP which must be approved by a “majority of the cities representing a majority of the population, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County and by the Central Basin Water Association and the San Gabriel Valley Watermaster.” The plan “shall include, but not be limited to,” the following:

“(1) A determination of the policies and priorities for the conservation of the San Gabriel River and its watershed, the Lower Los Angeles River, and the San Gabriel Mountains, in accordance with the purposes of the conservancy as set forth in section 32602.

“(2) A plan for incorporating, as relevant, the principles and planning work contained within the Los Angeles River Master Plan prepared by the County of Los Angeles.

“(3) An identification of underused existing public open spaces and recommendations for providing better public use and enjoyment in areas identified in the plan.

“(4) An identification of, and a priority program for implementing, those additional low-impact recreational and open space needs, including additional or upgraded facilities and parks that may be necessary or desirable.” (*Ibid.*)

Although the OSP, as set forth in section 32604 subsection (d), subdivisions (1-4), is conceived principally as a planning document, it does not have to be limited in scope to that function alone. The Legislature, by including the phrase, “**but not be limited to**,” intended that the RMC have the discretion to determine the scope of the plan and its level of specificity, consistent with the “purposes set forth in Section 32602.” (See Pub. Resources Code, §32604(a).) For example, section 32612 (c), provides that the RMC, prior to entering into an agreement to acquire an interest in real property, must notify the affected local agency if “such a project” was not included in the OSP.¹ This provision contemplates that the RMC has the authority to include project specific elements in the OSP.

Counsel for the Gateway Council of Governments, however, citing sections 32612 (c) and 32614 (c), has expressed concern that the RMC may be required to adopt a project specific open space plan, or at a minimum, include project specific elements in the plan such as the identification of parcels for acquisition. This requirement is not reflected in the Act. There is nothing in section 32604(d) that requires the RMC to prepare a project specific OSP, or to include project specific elements in the plan. Rather, the focus is on the adoption of general “policies and priorities” and the identification of underused existing public open space and recommendations for providing better public use. . .” (*ibid.*) The only mandatory elements of the OSP are those that are set forth in section 30604 subsection (d), subdivisions one through four. All other elements, as discussed above, are subject to the discretion of the RMC. This understanding of the RMC’s authority is implicit in sections 32612 (c) and 32614 (c). These sections specifically provide that the RMC may proceed with future projects, subject to notice requirements, even if they are not mentioned in the OSP. They do not require the RMC to adopt a project specific OSP.

Here, the RMC, in consultation with the public entities that must approve the OSP, is in the process of preparing the OSP. The stated purpose of the plan, as proposed, is “to provide a comprehensive framework for watershed and open space planning within the RMC’s jurisdiction.” (See OSP In Progress Draft, p. 1.) It is intended to serve as a “basis for future detailed planning at subwatershed levels as well as to guide the policies and programs of the RMC.” (*ibid.*) Given the practical and inherent difficulties of developing a plan involving over 60 different jurisdictions, the OSP, initially, will establish a set of general guiding principles, identify existing resources and land use management within the RMC’s jurisdiction, and address potential projects types consistent with the purposes and objectives of the RMC. The OSP will not target specific expenditure of funds, identify specific parcels for acquisition or commit the agency to follow a course of action with respect to any particular aspect of the OSP. In short, the RMC Board and Executive Officer envision the OSP as a long-range planning guide.²

THE OSP AND CEQA PROCESS

The initial issue you have raised is whether it is necessary to comply with the provisions of CEQA in the development and adoption of the OSP. The short answer is yes. However, as noted above, compliance with CEQA does not necessarily compel the preparation of an envi-

¹Public Resources Code, section 32614 (c), includes an identical notice requirement with respect to leases, rentals, sales, exchanges or other transfers of real property or interest by the RMC to qualified public agencies or non-profit entities.

²Our understanding regarding the nature and scope of the proposed OSP is based on representations made by the Executive Officer and the consultant retained by the RMC to prepare the OSP. To the extent the final OSP differs from the In Progress Draft it may be necessary to revise our informal advice.

ronmental impact report (EIR) or negative declaration. Under CEQA, an agency must first determine whether the proposed activity is exempt or not a project within the meaning of CEQA. If it is determined that the action is exempt or a “non-project,” no further review under CEQA is necessary. It is our view that the OSP, as proposed, is not a “project” within the meaning of CEQA, and therefore is not subject to further environmental review. In addition, the OSP, as proposed, is exempt from the need to prepare an environmental impact report.

Under CEQA, state agencies must prepare an environmental impact report on any “project” they propose to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21100.) A “project” is defined as the “whole of an action which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.” (Pub. Resources Code, § 21065; CEQA Guidelines, §15378.³)

Not all governmental activities, however, are “projects” within the meaning of CEQA. CEQA specifically excludes from the definition of a “project” continuing administrative activities such as personnel-related actions, the purchase of supplies, as well as general policy and procedure making, except as related to specific development projects or implementation activities. (CEQA Guidelines, §15378 (b).)

The courts in exploring the definition of “project” have focused on whether the state action is a “necessary step in a chain of events which would culminate in physical impact on the environment.” (Fullerton Joint Union High School District v. State Board of Education (1982) 32 Cal.3d 779, 795.) For example, in Kaufman & Broad-South Bay v. Morgan Hill Unified School District (1992) 9 Cal.App.3d 464, the Court of Appeal concluded that the establishment of a Mello-Roos district for the purposes of raising revenue for future school construction was not a “project” within the meaning of CEQA because such action did not “commit the District to any definite action . . . dictate how funds will be spent, or in any way narrow the field of options and alternatives available to the District.” (*Id.* at 476; also see Bozung v. Local Agency Formation Commission (1975) 13 Cal.3d 263.)

Certain start-up activities, although “projects” within the meaning of CEQA, may be exempt from additional CEQA review. (See CEQA Guidelines, §§15260–15285 and 15300–15329.) For example, a project involving only feasibility or planning studies for possible future actions which the agency had not approved, adopted or funded, does not require the preparation of an environmental impact report or negative declaration. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15262.)⁴

Additionally, the broad definition of project is tempered by the requirement that CEQA applies only to those activities which may have a “significant effect on the environment.” (*Id.* at section 15061(b)(3).) Thus, even if a “project” does not fit into an exemption, it may nonetheless not be subject to further CEQA review, including the preparation of an environmental impact report, if it can be shown with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question will have a significant effect on the environment. “Significant effect” is defined under CEQA as a “substantial, or potentially substantial adverse change” in the environment. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15382.)

³All references to “CEQA Guidelines” refer to title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, section 15000 et seq.

⁴This section “does not apply to the adoption of a plan that will have a legally binding effect on later activities.” (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15262.)

Here, the OSP, as proposed, will contain general principles, goals and policies with respect to watershed and open space planning for the watershed areas of the San Gabriel and lower Los Angeles Rivers. These general criteria are intended to assist the RMC and member cities in setting priorities and guiding the review of future proposals to acquire, to develop and to manage lands in the RMC's territory. Essentially, it is an interim policy document. (See OSP In Progress Draft, p. 1 ["The plan is intended to serve as a basis for more detailed planning . . ."].) The OSP does not target the specific expenditure of funds, identify specific parcels for acquisition, commit the agency to follow a definite course of action with respect to any particular aspect of the OSP, nor is it intended to have a legally binding effect on later activities. As such, the document constitutes "general policy and procedure making" and is, therefore, not a project under CEQA. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15378(b)(2); also see Northwood Homes, Inc. v. Moraga (1989) 216 Cal.App.3d 1197 [held, guidelines implementing open space ordinance adopted by initiative is not a "project" but is a "continuing administrative activity such as general policy and procedure making which is expressly excluded from definition of project under CEQA."].) This is in contrast to a "general plan" which identifies specific land uses and has a legally binding effect on later activities. (See CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15262 [see Office of Planning and Research (OPR) "Discussion"]; 15378 (a)(1).) General plans, unlike the open space plan required of the RMC, are expressly defined as "project[s]" under CEQA. (Ibid.)⁵

Further, we conclude that the OSP, as proposed, is exempt under section 15262 of the CEQA Guidelines, which provides that a project involving only feasibility or planning studies for possible future action does not require the preparation of an environmental impact report or negative declaration. Finally, because the OSP is only a planning guide, it can reasonably be argued that it falls under the "common sense" exemption which applies "where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15061 (b) (3).)

Our conclusion that the adoption of the OSP will not, by itself, have a significant effect on the environment is consistent with the large number of categorical exemptions in the CEQA Guidelines for projects that preserve natural resources, open space or parks. (See e.g., CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15307 [actions to protect natural resources], 15308 [actions protecting the environment], 15313 [acquisition of land for wildlife conservation purposes], 15316 [transfer of ownership in order to create a park], and 15325 [transfers of ownership to preserve open space].) Even if these sections are not specifically applicable to the OSP, the existence of these exemptions, which will likely apply to many of the future activities contemplated by the RMC, supports the conclusion that the mere adoption of an open space plan will not have a significant effect on the environment.

We caution that while the OSP, as proposed, is not subject to further CEQA review, activities related to implementation of the plan or future revisions of the OSP may require the preparation of an environmental impact report. Such activities include but are not limited to, adoption of a specific facilities construction plan, site improvement projects, rehabilitation of degraded areas, identification of specific projects to be considered and acted on by the RMC, and/or designation of specific parcels for acquisition. (See Pub. Resources Code, §32614 (g).) As set forth above, any activity which commits the RMC to any definite course of action and is

⁵Similarly, the OSP also meets the definition of a "non-project" under section 15378 (b)(5) of the CEQA Guidelines, which provides that "organizational or administrative activities of governments which are . . . not physical changes in the environment" are not "projects" for purposes of triggering CEQA review.

an essential step culminating in action which may affect the environment will require additional review under CEQA. (Kaufman & Broad, supra, 9 Cal.App.4th at 474-476.) The OSP, as proposed, however, is not such an action.

Procedurally, the RMC, as the lead agency⁶ under CEQA, should it adopt the OSP, must make specific findings that the OSP is not a “project” within the meaning of CEQA and identify the legal basis for its determination (i.e., CEQA Guidelines, §§15061 (b)(3), 15378(b)(2) & (5). Should the RMC also conclude that the OSP is exempt, it must also adopt findings that the OSP is exempt under CEQA Guidelines, section 15262, and file a Notice of Exemption with the Office of Planning and Research.

THE IMPACT OF THE OSP ON THE RMC’S MEMBER CITIES

You have also asked us to evaluate the effect of the adoption of the OSP on the region, individual cities and affected landowners. Specifically, you have asked whether approval of the OSP will give the RMC regulatory or governing authority over its member cities or over any ordinance, general or specific plan enacted by any local jurisdiction within its territory, or whether the member cities, by approving the OSP, are surrendering any regulatory authority or power that they currently possess. In addressing this issue we must look to the legislation creating the RMC.

The San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy Act (“Act”) (e.g., Pub. Resources Code, § 32660 et seq.), was introduced and enacted, in part, in response to the interest of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG) (27 cities including Long Beach and Downey) and the San Gabriel Valley COG (another 29 cities). These groups supported the creation of a multi-jurisdictional agency authorized to acquire land, and conduct watershed management, flood control, and recreational projects within the lower Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River watersheds. (See bill analysis, AB 1355 (Stats. 1999, ch. 788), April 19, 1999, p. 3.)

The authors of the legislation envisioned that the RMC and member cities would be equal partners in the planning, development and management of the watershed areas. (Id.) The member cities, although in principle in favor of the creation of the RMC, wanted assurances that the new state agency would not be empowered with eminent domain authority and that the cities would retain control over their own land use regulations, ordinances, general and regional plans.

To that end, the Act places restrictions on the powers and rights of the RMC in deference to the authority of the member cities. For example, section 32620 of the Act, provides that “[n]othing in this division shall be interpreted to grant the [RMC] board any regulatory or governing authority over any ordinance or regulatory measure adopted by a city, county, or special district that pertains to land use, water rights or environmental quality.” The general directive that local entities shall retain control over land use and water matters is reiterated in other provisions of the Act. In section 32613 (b), the RMC is expressly “subject to all laws, regulations, and general and specific plans of the legislative body of any city in which the conservancy proposes to take action.” In section 32621, the RMC is prohibited from interfering or engaging in activities which conflict with the powers and duties of any local entity responsible for water management. Similarly, in exercising its right of first refusal for surplus public agency property located within

⁶The “lead agency” is the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15367.)

its jurisdiction, the RMC must “conform to all relevant general and specific plans and zoning regulations of local agencies within the territory of the conservancy.” (Pub. Resources Code, §32612(b).)

Further, neither the RMC nor the State Public Works Board is authorized to exercise the power of eminent domain pursuant to the Act. (Pub. Resources Code, §32612 (a); also see section 32613(b) [“(T)he conservancy may not levy a tax, exercise the power of eminent domain or regulate land use except on lands its owns, manages or controls”].)

Finally, the RMC is required to provide notification before it takes an action that might have an impact on a member city. For example, prior to engaging in activities that are not included in the OSP, the RMC must provide written notice to the legislative body of the affected local agency. (Pub. Resources Code, §32614(c).) Similarly, when the RMC proposes any action that may affect any water right or delivery system, it must provide written notice to every water association in the jurisdiction of the RMC. (Pub. Resources Code, §32621(b).)

In short, the Act contemplates that notwithstanding approval of the OSP by the member cities, local entities will still retain existing control over local land use and water management issues. In light of the above, we do not believe that the member cities can be compelled to amend their general plans to conform to the OSP, nor do we believe that member approval of the OSP will “trigger” RMC control over local land use and water management matters. An interpretation to the contrary would render virtually the entire Act null and void. Statutes are to be given a reasonable and common sense interpretation consistent with the apparent legislative purpose. (Dyna-Med v. Fair Employment & Housing Commission (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1379, 1392.) Here, of course, it was the intent of the Legislature that the member cities retain existing regulatory control over local land use and water issues. Therefore, we conclude that, notwithstanding approval of the OSP, the powers of the RMC are limited to those expressly set forth in the Act.⁷

Finally, we note that there is no explicit requirement in the legislation that the member cities amend their general or regional plans to conform to the OSP or that the member cities by approving the OSP, cede control over local land use issues. Certainly, if the Legislature had intended to require the member cities to amend their general plans it would have directly addressed that issue in the Act, particularly where such a requirement is inconsistent with the Act’s principal directive that local entities retain authority over their own general and specific plans. (See Dyna-Med, supra, 43 Cal.3d at 1392.) In the absence of ambiguity in the statute and lack of extrinsic sources to the contrary, the “plain meaning” of the statute governs. (Ibid.)

CONCLUSION

In summary, because the OSP, as proposed, is a “general policy making” document, CEQA does not compel the preparation of an environment impact report. We note that subse-

⁷ The RMC has also asked that we address the effect of the adoption of the OSP on adjacent landowners within the RMC’s jurisdiction. Because the OSP is only a long-range planning guide, it should have no legally significant impact on adjacent landowners. Further, the RMC does not have eminent domain authority so there is no threat of condemnation. (Pub. Resources Code, §§32612(a) and 32613(b).) Finally, we note that under the Act, the overall “objective” of the land acquisition program “shall be to assist in accomplishing land transactions that are mutually beneficial to the landowner and the conservancy . . .” (Pub. Resources Code, § 32612 (a).) Thus, to the extent there is any impact on the adjacent landowner it is likely to be a favorable one.

quent activities related to the implementation or amendment of the OSP may require further CEQA review including the preparation of a negative declaration or an environmental impact report. Finally, it is our view that approval of the OSP by a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population within the RMC's jurisdiction will not require the member cities to amend their general plans to conform to the OSP or trigger state control of local regulatory and governing authority. It was the intent of the Legislature in creating the RMC, that the cities would retain their existing control over local land use and water management concerns. Please let us know if you have any questions or comments about this letter.

Sincerely,

TERRY T. FUJIMOTO
Deputy Attorney General

For BILL LOCKYER
Attorney General

cc: Magret Kim
Richard M. Frank
J. Matthew Rodriguez
John A. Saurenman

CITY OF _____
 RESOLUTION NO. _____
 RESOLUTION APPROVING THE SAN GABRIEL AND LOWER
 LOS ANGELES PARKWAY AND OPEN SPACE PLAN

WHEREAS, the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy Act (the "ACT"), Public Resources Code, Division 22.8, commencing at § 32600 (Stats. 1998, Ch. 788 (AB 1355)), created the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy (the "RMC") for the purpose of acquiring and managing public lands within the Lower Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River watersheds, and to provide open-space, low impact recreational and educational uses, water conservation, watershed improvement, wildlife and habitat restoration and protection, and water quality within the territory;

WHEREAS, the territory of the RMC extends across the city boundaries of over sixty cities, as set forth in section 32603 (c)(2)(A), as well as the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and Orange County adjacent to the San Gabriel River and its tributaries, the lower Los Angeles River and its tributaries, the San Gabriel Mountains, the Foothill Mountains, the Puente Hills, and the San Jose Hills area including but not limited to, East Los Angeles;

WHEREAS, the RMC was created, in part, in response to the interest of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG) and the San Gabriel Valley COG, and other local public entities, in creating a multi-jurisdictional agency that would be authorized to acquire land, and conduct watershed management, flood control, and recreational projects within the Lower Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River watersheds;

WHEREAS, the RMC board is composed of voting members who represent the County of Los Angeles, the Gateway Cities Council of Governments and the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, Orange County Division of the League of California Cities, San Gabriel Valley Water Association, Central Basin Water Association, as well as state agencies including, the Resources Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Finance;

WHEREAS, it was intent of the State Legislature in creating the RMC, that the RMC and member cities would be equal partners in the planning, development and management of mountain and watershed areas within the RMC's territory, and to that end, the Legislature provides in the ACT that member cities shall retain control over their own land use regulations, ordinances, general and regional plans;

WHEREAS, under the ACT, the RMC shall be subject to all laws, regulations, and general and specific plans of the legislative body of any city in which the RMC proposes to take action;

WHEREAS, nothing in the ACT shall be interpreted to grant the RMC any regulatory or governing authority over any ordinance or regulatory measure adopted by a city, county or special district that pertains to land use, water rights, or environmental quality;

WHEREAS, section 32604 (d) of the Public Resources Code directs the RMC to prepare a San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Parkway and Open Space Plan (the "OSP") to be approved by a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, and by the Central Basis Water Association and San Gabriel Water Wa-
 termaster;

WHEREAS, the RMC, in consultation with representatives of the Gateway COG, San Gabriel COG, the County of Los Angeles, Orange County, the San Gabriel Water Association and Central Basis Water Association, has prepared a draft OSP;

WHEREAS, the RMC has conducted public meetings for public review and for receipt of public comments on the draft OSP;

WHEREAS, on or about _____, 2001, the RMC Board, at the conclusion of its public meeting and review of all the documentary and oral evidence related to the OSP, adopted the draft OSP and made the following findings; (1) that the OSP complies with all applicable requirements of law; (2) that the OSP is consistent with the purposes of the RMC as set forth in section 32602 of the Public Resources Code; (3) that the OSP contains all the required elements set forth in section 32604 (d) (1-4); (4) that the OSP is not a “project” within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (e.g., CEQA Guidelines, §15378(b)(2)); (5) that, alternatively, the OSP, as an activity involving only feasibility or planning studies for future actions, is exempt from the environmental impact report requirements of CEQA review; and (6) that the OSP is a long range planning guide or interim policy document and does not commit the RMC to follow a definite course of action with respect to any particular aspect of the OSP, nor is it intended to have a legally binding effect on later activities.

WHEREAS, following adoption of the OSP by the RMC Board, the OSP was referred to the member cities for their review and approval pursuant to section 32604(d) of the Public Resources Code;

WHEREAS, the City has conducted public meetings for public review and for receipt of public comments relating to the OSP;

WHEREAS, City Staff has reviewed the OSP, public comments as well as documentary evidence relating to the OSP;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE CITY OF _____ HEREBY:

1. FINDS that the OSP complies with the requirements of section 32604(d) of the Public Resources Code and includes all the mandatory elements set forth in section 32604(d)(1–4) of the Public Resources Code;
2. FINDS that the OSP is not a “project” within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (e.g., CEQA Guidelines, §15378(b)(2));
3. FINDS that approval of the OSP by the City will not require the City to modify, amend, or revise in any way its specific or general plan, ordinances or regulations, or effect in any way the City’s regulatory or governing authority over land use or water rights and management issues within its jurisdiction;
4. FINDS that approval by the City of the OSP does not constitute agreement with the policies, principles and statements set forth in the OSP,
5. FINDS that approval by the City of the OSP does not constitute a waiver of the City’s regulatory or governing authority over land use, water rights or environments issues within its jurisdiction or territory;

- 6. FINDS that approval by the City of the OSP does not constitute adoption or incorporation of the OSP as part of the general plan, specific plan or any ordinance, law or regulation of this City;
- 7. FINDS that the OSP is an interim policy document or long range planning guide, that it does not commit the RMC or the City to follow a definite course of action with respect to any aspect of the OSP, and that it is not intended to have a legally binding effect on later activities of the RMC or the City;
- 8. FINDS that the OSP is, in principle, consistent with the general and specific plan and with ordinances, laws and regulations that pertain to land use, water rights, or environmental quality of this City;
- 9. APPROVES the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Parkway and Open Space Plan (OSP), in accordance with section 32604 (d) of the Public Resources Code.

--End of Resolution--

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council for the City of _____, held on the ___ day of _____, 2001.

DATED:

Mayor of the City of _____

ATTEST: _____
City Attorney

APPENDIX F

Project Evaluation Criteria

State of California
The Resources Agency
SAN GABRIEL & LOWER LOS ANGELES
RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY

PROJECT
EVALUATION CRITERIA

April 6, 2001

SAN GABRIEL & LOWER LOS ANGELES
RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY
PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

Select only one criterion that best fits the attributes of the site for each value. The rating number assigned to the criterion is then multiplied by the weight assigned to the value. The scores for each value can be compared and evaluated in total, by grouping, or individually.

OPEN SPACE PLAN VALUE WEIGHT

CRITERION RATING

- The site is specifically referred to as a project in the Open Space Plan. 4
- The site meets the criteria for inclusion in the Open Space Plan. 2
- The site does not meet the criteria as outlined in the Open Space Plan. 0

URBAN RESOURCE VALUE WEIGHT

CRITERION RATING

- The site has natural geologic contours and/or vegetation and is surrounded by urban development. 4
- The site contributes to an existing or proposed park, natural area, corridor or greenway in an urbanized area. 4
- The site is located in an under-served or park-poor community. 3
- The site provides linkage to open space in an adjacent urban area. 2
- The site is located in an industrialized area. 1
- The site is not located in an urban setting. 0

WATERSHED RESOURCE VALUE WEIGHT

CRITERION RATING

- The site is located within a county-designated ecologically sensitive watershed or significant ecological area. 4
- The site contains natural riparian habitat. 4
- The site would enhance flood control measures if developed for open space use. 4
- The site would provide quality storm water runoff. 4
- The site contributes to the persistence of ecosystem processes which may pose a hazard to life and property if the site were developed. 3
- The site contains groundwater recharge capabilities. 3
- The site supports substantial upland vegetative cover in a watercourse. 3
- The site has the potential for hazard-reduction/mitigation credits if preserved verses developed. 3

- | | |
|--|---|
| • The site has opportunities for non-point source water pollution reduction. | 2 |
| • The site provides access to an existing or planned watershed resource. | 1 |
| • The site has no watershed resource value. | 0 |

TRAIL RESOURCE VALUE	WEIGHT
----------------------	--------

CRITERION	RATING
-----------	--------

- | | |
|---|---|
| • The site is identified as the path of a major existing or planned trail. | 4 |
| • The site would provide connection within and/or between communities and major existing or planned trails. | 4 |
| • The site would provide urban walkways. | 3 |
| • The site would provide amenities that would enhance public use of a trail. | 3 |
| • The site would accommodate a new trail into an inaccessible area. | 2 |
| • The site would provide a scenic buffer for an existing or planned trail. | 1 |
| • The site would not support a trail or walkway. | 0 |

RECREATIONAL RESOURCE VALUE	WEIGHT
-----------------------------	--------

CRITERION	RATING
-----------	--------

- | | |
|--|---|
| • The site contains a suitable area for a recreational facility – educational center, picnic area, useable open space, campground, or interpretive center. | 4 |
| • The site could provide an access point, parking, &/or interpretive display for an adjacent protected area or overlook. | 3 |
| • The site could support recreational development ancillary to the primary value of an adjacent protected area. | 2 |
| • The site could provide additional access to an adjacent protected area. | 1 |
| • The site can not support recreational use due to configuration or potential natural or cultural resource degradation. | 0 |

WILDLIFE RESOURCE VALUE	WEIGHT
-------------------------	--------

CRITERION	RATING
-----------	--------

- | | |
|--|---|
| • The site is used by state or federally-listed fauna species. | 4 |
| • The site contributes to the connection of existing protected core areas by serving as a habitat linkage or movement corridor for wildlife. | 4 |
| • The site contains fresh water habitat and/or a perennial natural water source. | 4 |
| • The site is used by fauna that are candidate(s) for state or federal listing. | 3 |
| • The site increases the effective size of a protected area. | 3 |
| • The site largely contains undisturbed habitat with moderate to high species diversity. | 3 |

- | | |
|--|---|
| • The habitat is degraded but conditions are suitable for regeneration or restoration. | 2 |
| • The habitat is unsuitable for candidate or listed species but provides a buffer between protected sites & incompatible uses. | 1 |
| • The site is degraded & habitat restoration is not economically justifiable. | 0 |

<u>FLORISTIC RESOURCE VALUE</u>	<u>WEIGHT</u>
---------------------------------	---------------

CRITERION	RATING
-----------	--------

- | | |
|--|---|
| • The site contains a state or federally-listed flora species or habitat. | 4 |
| • The site largely contains undisturbed communities with moderate to high species diversity. | 4 |
| • The site contains a flora species that is candidate for state or federally listing. | 3 |
| • The habitat is degraded but conditions are suitable for regeneration or restoration of native species & communities. | 2 |
| • The habitat is unsuitable for sensitive species but provides a buffer between protected lands & incompatible uses. | 1 |
| • The site is degraded & habitat restoration is not economically justifiable. | 0 |

<u>ARCHAEOLOGICAL OR HISTORIC RESOURCE VALUE</u>	<u>WEIGHT</u>
--	---------------

CRITERION	RATING
-----------	--------

- | | |
|---|---|
| • The site contains a registered archaeological or historical resource of national or statewide significance. | 4 |
| • The site contains a registered archaeological or historical resource of regional significance. | 3 |
| • The site contains a registered archaeological or historical resource of local significance. | 2 |
| • The site contains an archaeological or historic resource that is damaged. | 1 |
| • It is unknown if the site contains archaeological or historic resources. | 0 |

<u>ACCESS VALUE</u>	<u>WEIGHT</u>
---------------------	---------------

CRITERION	RATING
-----------	--------

- | | |
|--|---|
| • The site would be easily accessible by the public with full right-of-way. | 4 |
| • The site is located in a residential area with limited signage opportunities. | 3 |
| • The site is within walking distance from public transportation. | 3 |
| • The site has features making it easily accessible to people with limited mobility or other disabilities. | 3 |
| • The site would be accessible via an adjacent protected area. | 2 |
| • The site has adequate space for on site parking or available street parking, but is located in an area where neighborhood conflicts may arise. | 1 |

- The site is constrained from public access by lack of right-of-way. 1
- A public right-of-way for the site is currently unobtainable. 0

SCENIC RESOURCE VALUE **WEIGHT**

CRITERION **RATING**

- The site is part of an area of exceptional scenic value and/or has been so identified in a government agency plan. 4
- The site contains a significant overlook of the surrounding area. 3
- The site contains unique scenic natural resources such as waterfalls, wildflower displays, geologic formations, vistas of scenic grandeur. 3
- The site contains viewshed of an open space area, river or public use area. 2
- The site contains scenic resources that are representative of the area. 1
- The site is obscured from view of the general public and does not have overlook value. 0

PARTNER RESOURCE VALUE **WEIGHT**

- The site is of significance to one or more partner government agencies and/or non-government organization's that have funds available for the acquisition. 4
- The site is of significance to a partner agency that would undertake ownership and/or management responsibilities. 3
- Acquisition of the site would assist a government agency to fulfill its master land protection or recreation plan but matching funds are not available. 2
- The site is of significance to a local citizen group but does not fulfill a governing agency land protection or recreation plan. 1
- The site is of no current or known significance to a partner. 0

ECONOMIC VALUE **WEIGHT**

CRITERION **RATING**

- Funding has been specifically allocated by a government entity. 4
- Development threat of the site is imminent that would preclude future park use and the site is available for sale. 4
- Site holds potential to clean up an identified brownfield 4
- The site is available under bargain or opportunity sale conditions. 3
- The owner of the site is willing to sell at appraised value to the government. 3
- The site is subject to substantial, but less than imminent, threat of development, with unmitigable impacts. 2
- The owner of the site is willing to sell but at an inflated value. 1
- The owner of the site is currently an unwilling seller. 0

CONCEPTUAL AREA PROTECTION PLAN

A Program Area can span across several geographic regions, but projects within an area share a similar goal. Program Areas allow the Conservancy to evaluate properties and/or projects in relation to existing protected areas and programs, comparing both with the projected biological and recreational needs of the area. Borders of these programs bleed into each other and may overlap in some areas. Connectivity is necessary when looking at the entire region that is included in the Conservancy's mission.

A Program Area Structure serves as a planning tool for the region to protect large blocks of habitat and provide for appropriate recreational needs. The criteria used for evaluation is a set format, but will eventually be applied with different weights depending on the projected biological and recreational needs of each Program Area. A Program Area Structure is a long-term planning instrument with properties grouped in three tiers according to funding priority.

TABLE 1
SAN GABRIEL & LOWER LOS ANGELES
RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY
LISTING OF PROGRAM AREAS

1. Greenways along the San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers
2. Conservation of Lands in the Foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains
3. Conservation of Lands in the San Jose, Puente, and Chino Hills
4. Connected Urban Trails System
5. Parks for "park poor" Urban Areas
6. Community Programs (i.e. Education, Community Gardens, etc.)
7. Renovation of Existing Parks

SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA		
<i>Wildlife Resource Value</i>		
	CRITERION	<u>RATING</u>
WR1	The site lies wholly within a large block of undisturbed core habitat.	4
WR2	The site is used by state or federally-listed animal species.	4
WR3	The site directly contributes to the connection of two core habitat areas by serving as a habitat linkage or movement corridor for wildlife.	4
WR4	The site contains important fresh water habitat and/or a perennial natural water source.	4
WR5	The site directly contributes to the connection of two substantially-sized (but not core) habitat areas.	3
WR6	The site is used by an animal that is a candidate for state or federal listing	3
WR7	The site directly abuts and increases the effective size of a protected habitat area.	3
WR8	The site contains largely undisturbed habitat with a substantial section of riparian habitat.	3
WR9	The site contains largely undisturbed habitat but without a substantial section of riparian habitat.	2
WR10	The site is known to be used by state-designated sensitive animal species.	2
WR11	The site supplies habitat for only the most human-tolerant native species.	1
WR12	The site is severely degraded and habitat restoration is not feasible or economically justifiable.	0
<i>Floristic Resource Value</i>		
	CRITERION	<u>RATING</u>
FR1	The site contains a state or federally-listed plant species.	4
FR2	The site contains a high percent (>25%) cover of full canopy forest and/or oak woodland.	4
FR3	The site contains 10-25% cover of full canopy forest and/or oak woodland.	3
FR4	The site contains a plant species that is a candidate for state or federally listing.	3
FR5	The site largely contains largely undisturbed communities with moderate to high species diversity.	3
FR6	The site contains a plant community that is rare or unusual in the region.	3
FR7	The site contains either a state or cnps-designated sensitive plant species.	2
FR8	The site contains largely undisturbed plant communities with low species diversity.	2
FR9	The habitat is partially degraded but conditions are suitable for natural regeneration or restoration.	1
FR10	The site provides virtually no habitat for native species.	0

<i>Trail Resource Value</i>	
CRITERION	<u>RATING</u>
TR1 The site contains a significant, irreplaceable link in a major existing or planned trail. (i.e., “irreplaceable” means topography or other considerations would not permit realignment onto another parcel).	4
TR2 The site contains a portion of a less-than-major existing or planned trail.	3
TR3 The site contains a trailhead location with adequate parking for a major existing or planned trail.	3
TR4 The site provides critical viewshed within a major trail corridor.	3
TR5 The site could accommodate a new trail or provide a connection from a populated area or an accessible trailhead to an existing trail.	2
TR6 The site contains easy, level trail opportunities through scenic and natural areas that are accessible to trail users of many ages and physical conditions.	2
TR7 The site contains a trailhead location with adequate parking only for a less-than-major existing or planned trail.	2
TR8 The site does not provide critical viewshed within a major trail corridor, but does offer substantial scenic buffer for an existing or planned trail.	2
TR9 The site provides urban walkways.	1
TR10 The site would not support a trail or walkway.	0
<i>Scenic Resource Value</i>	
CRITERION	<u>RATING</u>
SR1 The site is part of an area of exceptional scenic value or has been so identified in an official planning document (e.g., a county area plan, NPS plan, scenic highway element).	4
SR2 The site contains critical viewshed of a major public park/public use area or from a designated primary scenic roadway.	4
SR3 The site contains unique scenic elements; e.g. waterfalls; spectacular wildflower displays; geologic formations; vistas of scenic grandeur.	3
SR4 The site contains important, but less than critical, viewshed of a major park/public use area.	3
SR5 The site contains important viewshed but not to a major public use area or park.	2
SR6 The site provides a significant (accessible) viewpoint or overlook of surrounding areas.	2
SR7 The site contains natural terrain with just average scenic qualities.	1
SR8 The site contains no natural terrain or little or no scenic value.	0
<i>Other Recreational Resource Value</i>	
CRITERION	<u>RATING</u>
ORR1 The site contains a suitable area for a planned major recreational facility—campground, picnic area, or interpretive center; with road access.	4
ORR2 The site provides area just for a smaller-scale recreational facility.	3

ORR3	The site contains moderate potential for development of parkland access or other recreational facilities.	2
ORR4	The site provides buffer for any non-trail related recreational facility.	1
ORR5	The site provides additional parking potential for an existing or potential recreation facility	1
ORR6	The site cannot support any recreational use because of physical constraints or potential natural or cultural resource degradation.	0
<i>Archaeological or Historic Resource Value</i>		
	CRITERION	<u>RATING</u>
AHR1	The site contains a registered archaeological or historic resource of national or statewide significance.	4
AHR2	The site contains a registered federal or state historic resource.	3
AHR3	The site contains a registered archaeological resource of regional significance.	3
AHR4	The site contains a registered archaeological or historic resource of local importance.	2
AHR5	The site is directly adjacent to a known historic or archaeologically significant site, and may be reasonably expected to have significant resources but is presently not surveyed.	2
AHR6	The site is a local community landmark.	1
AHR7	The site contains an archaeological or historic resource of limited importance.	1
AHR8	The site contains no known archaeological or historic resources, with minimal potential for same.	0
<i>Urban Resource Value</i>		
	CRITERION	<u>RATING</u>
UR1	The site provides a significant contribution to an existing or proposed natural corridor or greenway.	4
UR2	The site contains substantial-sized or representative sample of a native plant community surrounded by dense urban development and/or disadvantaged populations.	4
UR3	The site provides a moderate contribution to an existing or proposed natural corridor or greenway.	3
UR4	The site is located in an extremely park-poor community.	3
UR5	The site provides a minor component of an existing or proposed natural corridor or greenway.	2
UR6	The site contains a less-than-substantial-sized or representative sample of a native plant community surrounded by dense urban development and/or disadvantaged populations.	2
UR7	The site contains substantial potential for restoration of natural vegetation.	2
UR8	The site contains limited potential for restoration of natural vegetation.	1
UR9	The site has opportunities for active recreation.	1
UR10	The site is not proximate to dense urban development.	0
UR11	The site has expected environmental contamination problems.	-1

<i>Watershed Resource Value</i>		
CRITERION		<u>RATING</u>
WSR1	Over two-thirds of the site is located within a county-designated ecologically sensitive watershed or significant ecological area.	4
WSR2	The majority of the site is part of a watershed draining directly into an ecologically sensitive part of a state or federal park.	4
WSR3	The site supports substantial upland vegetative cover in a predominately natural watershed.	3
WSR4	At least one fourth of the site is located within a designated ecologically-sensitive watershed or significant ecological area.	3
WSR5	The site contains a substantial area (greater than 0.5 acre) of riparian or wetland habitat that integrates with a block of upland habitat.	3
WSR6	The site provides a location for a substantial-sized (>0.2 acre) or environmentally-significant riparian or wetland restoration project.	2
WSR7	The site contains good riparian or wetland habitat, >0.2 acre, but which is poorly integrated with upland habitat.	2
WSR8	The site contains between 0.05 to 0.19 acres of good riparian or wetland habitat but which is poorly integrated with upland habitat.	1
WSR9	The site provides a location for a less than substantial-sized (<0.2 acres) riparian or wetland restoration project.	1
WSR10	The site has little or no riparian habitat, watershed protection, or restoration value.	0
<i>Access Value</i>		
CRITERION		<u>RATING</u>
A1	The site is easily accessible from urban communities and provides adequate parking.	4
A2	The site is within walking distance from public transportation.	4
A3	The site has features making it easily accessible to people with limited mobility or other disabilities.	4
A4	The site has good potential for improving or developing substantial ADA accessibility.	3
A5	The site has adequate space for onsite parking or available street parking that will not conflict with neighborhood needs or sentiment.	2
A6	The site has adequate space for on site parking or available street parking, but is located in an area where neighborhood conflicts may arise.	1
A7	The site has good public access, but with limited ada potential.	1
A8	Access is not feasible except through additional acquisitions or easements.	0
<i>Partnership Value</i>		
CRITERION		<u>RATING</u>
P1	The site is of great significance to one or more partner government agencies	4

	and/or non-profit organizations with substantial matching funding.	
P2	Acquisition of the site would fulfill a large component of a government agency master land protection or recreation plan.	3
P3	A partner agency would undertake ownership or management responsibilities.	2
P4	The site is of significance to a local citizen group but does not fulfill a publically-adopted land protection or recreation plan.	1
P5	The site is of no current or known significance to a partner.	0
<i>Economic Opportunity Value</i>		
	CRITERION	<u>RATING</u>
EO1	The site is available under extraordinary bargain or opportunity sale conditions.	4
EO2	The site is subject to imminent threat of development, with unmitigable impacts, that would preclude future park use.	4
EO3	Funding has been specifically allocated in the State Budget as a line item or legislative intent.	4
EO4	The site is subject to substantial, but less than imminent, threat of development, with unmitigable impacts.	3
EO5	The site is available under less than extraordinary bargain or opportunity sale conditions.	2
EO6	Current appraisal has been done or is under review by Department of General Services.	1
EO7	The owner of the site is a known willing seller.	1
EO8	The owner of the site is currently an unwilling seller.	0

SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY

PARK IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA

Adopted May 14, 2001

The Park Improvement and Development Projects Evaluation Criteria have been developed for the assessment of projects nominated for the Conservancy's Workprogram 2000 to provide park improvement, trails, historical restoration, habitat restoration, interpretive programs, and planning for park enhancement projects. Land Acquisition Evaluation Criteria were previously adopted by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy for evaluation of properties nominated for purchase, with the Workprogram for Land Acquisition adopted by the Conservancy on September 28, 2000. Both evaluation processes provide guidelines for the Conservancy in its review of current projects and potential new projects. The Conservancy explicitly reserves the right to amend its Workprogram at any time to reflect the overall objective to protect, maintain, and enhance regional habitat and linkages, trail linkages; urban, river, and open space park projects.

GOAL TO ENCOURAGE REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PARK AND TRAIL PROJECTS

Through the Improvement Projects Evaluation Criteria, the Conservancy seeks to encourage regionally significant park, trail, and restoration projects. Projects are scored accordingly, and typically a project with the highest numeric scores in the largest number of Values categories, will rank above a project scoring high in only one or two categories. However, in project rankings, the Conservancy Board can apply a multiplier weight to the numeric score of a particular value or set of values, such as Urban Park Value, to provide geographic balance. Or, after all scores are totaled, the board may review a subset of projects (*e.g.* all urban projects or all river projects) and assign a subset priority ranking within those categories. A deciding weight for all projects will also be the degree to which Conservancy funds stimulate outside participation in funding a project.

Conservancy and MRCA Projects

The Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority have a primary responsibility for funding improvements on SMMC/MRCA owned or managed parklands in fulfillment of the Conservancy's mission. Therefore, the first priorities for funding are *Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy/Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority projects that are required by or which manifestly enhance the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy's statutory mission to provide resource protection, safety, access, visitor services, and educational interpretation.* These include the following categories:

SMMC/MRCA Lands Resource Protection Projects: Projects which facilitate protection of wildlife, habitat, and historical/archaeological resources on agency-managed parklands, including habitat restoration projects in urban or rural parks.

SMMC/MRCA Lands Vegetation Management and Fire Safety: Projects which facilitate fire safety and any required fuel modification zones on Conservancy and/or MRCA owned or managed parklands.

SMMC/MRCA Visitor-Serving Projects: Projects which provide for enhanced visitation, urban accessibility, and safety to SMMC/MRCA owned or managed parks (including signage, restrooms, parking, trail building or repairs, etc.). This includes new projects to implement statutory requirements to provide better accessibility under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

SMMC/MRCA Education and Interpretation Projects: Projects which are required to achieve or expand the outreach mission of the agency and which provide interpretive programs and materials to substantially enhance knowledge, appreciation, and enjoyment of the natural environment, open space, parklands, and rivers.

PARK IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS CRITERIA FOR NOMINATED PROJECTS:

PUBLIC RECREATION VALUE (other than trails)

- PR1:** The project implements a major component of an existing plan (such as the Rim of the Valley Trail Corridor Master Plan, county or city plans) related to a major recreational public use facility (*e.g.*, nature park, campground, picnic area, visitor center, or educational interpretive center). 4
- PR2:** The project provides improvements to a park site that currently serves, or is expected to serve, a visitor base in a regional or greater geographic area. 4
- PR3:** The project adds visitor-serving amenities and public safety improvements to public parkland (*e.g.*, signage, restrooms, lighting, etc.). 3
- PR 4:** The project provides a high quality access point or parking area for adjacent open space or parkland. 2

ACCESSIBILITY VALUE

- A1:** The project improvements exceed legal standards for accessibility. 4

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION/INTERPRETATION VALUE

- EE1:** The project provides educational/interpretive displays that will significantly enhance appreciation and enjoyment of a resource. 4
- EE2:** The project will provide park information materials and educational/interpretive information, available to a large number of visitors of all ages. 3
- EE3:** The project provides informational materials but to more limited audience. 2

NATURAL RESOURCES ENHANCEMENT VALUE

- NR1:** The project substantially restores riparian or wetland habitat (>0.2 acres). 4
- NR2:** The project improves or supports regeneration of important native vegetative cover on slopes near a stream or river, which if substantially disturbed may contribute to flood, erosion, creek sedimentation, or reduced groundwater recharge. 4
- NR3:** The project significantly enhances the potential for wildlife movement in an identified movement corridor chokepoint. 4
- NR4:** The project substantially restores a site by removal of exotic species and reestablishment of native species. 3
- NR5:** The project provides substantial tree planting of appropriate native species. 2

NR6: The site provides a small scale (0.05 to 0.19 acres) riparian or wetland restoration project.	2
<i>TRAIL PROJECT RESOURCE VALUE</i>	
TP1: The project builds a significant link in a major regional trail.	4
TP2: The project repairs a critical link on an existing major regional trail.	4
TP3: The project builds an important trailhead with parking for a major regional trail.	3
TP4: The project builds a new trail or repairs a trail which provides a connection from a populated area or trailhead to an existing trail.	3
TP5: The project builds or improves trail accessibility for trail users of a wide range of ability levels and physical conditions.	3
TP6: The project provides or enhances trail conditions for multi-use by equestrians, mountain bicyclists, and hikers.	2
TP7: The project provides or enhances a riverfront walking and bikeway trail.	2
<i>SCENIC AND AESTHETIC VALUE</i>	
SA1: The project provides aesthetic features (<i>e.g.</i> , outstanding design, art elements) to a park project that greatly enhance the park and visitor experience.	4
SA2: The project provides park or trail improvements located in an especially scenic area.	2
SA3: The project provides a vista point or scenic overlook over a significant viewshed.	2
<i>HISTORIC /CULTURAL RESTORATION VALUE</i>	
HC1: The project restores or enhances a federal or state-designated or eligible historic site, such as a National Register of Historic Places.	4
HC2: The restoration project provides a significant and unique aspect to public parkland (historical interest, cultural appreciation, educational interest).	4
HC3: The project restores or enhances a designated local community historic resource.	3
HC4: The historic/cultural restoration project is an integrated component of a larger park improvement project.	2
<i>URBAN PARK VALUE</i>	
UP1: The project will improve or significantly enhance open space parkland in a densely urban and/or park-poor community.	5
UP2: The project substantially improves a park site by eliminating or significantly remediating environmental contamination, such as that from urban runoff or onsite conditions	4

UP3: The project enhances or restores a substantial -sized (>2.0 acres) sample of a native ecosystem/plant community surrounded by an otherwise natural-resource-deficient urban area. 4

UP4: The project restores natural vegetation in smaller sized (<1.9 acres) park location in an otherwise natural-resource- deficient urban area. 3

SUSTAINABILITY VALUE

S1: Project provides substantial energy conservation measures and/or innovative power generation. 3

S2: Project provides state of the art design for wastewater and/or other innovative and substantial water conservation techniques 3

S3: Project provides innovative use of recycled materials in construction. 2

S4: The project reduces runoff and increases percolation on site with use of permeable surfaces. 2

PARTNERSHIP/ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY VALUE

PEO1: The project is significant to one or more partner government agencies and/or non-government organizations with funds available. 4

PEO2: Funding has been specifically allocated in the State Budget as a line item or legislative intent. 4

PEO3: Completion of the project would assist a government agency in fulfilling its master land protection or recreation plan. 3

PEO4: The project provides a plan or feasibility study that enhances cooperative land protection and recreation important to two or more governmental agencies or non-governmental organizations. 3

PEO5: A partner agency would provide maintenance of the improvements. 3

MATCHING FUNDS WEIGHTING

Scores for improvement projects that are matched with other funding sources can be given an extra weighted value:

Funding match on a one to one basis: Multiply total score X 2

Funding match on a two to one basis: Multiply total score X 3

APPENDIX G

Threatened and Endangered Species

Threatened and Endangered Species and Species of Concern Los Angeles County—Plants

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Alkali Mariposa Lily	<i>Calochortus striatus</i>	Species of concern	None
Aphanisma	<i>Aphanisma blitoides</i>	Species of concern	None
Ballona Cinquefoil	<i>Potentilla multijuga</i>	Species of concern	None
Beach Spectaclepod	<i>Dithyrea maritime</i>	Species of concern	Threatened
Big Bear Valley Woollypod	<i>Astragalus leucolobus</i>	Species of concern	None
Blair's Stephanomeria	<i>Stephanomeria blairii</i>	Species of concern	None
Blochman's Dudleya	<i>Dudleya blochmaniae</i> ssp <i>blochmaniae</i>	Species of concern	None
Braunton's Milk-Vetch	<i>Astragalus brauntonii</i>	Endangered	None
Bright Green Dudleya	<i>Dudleya virens</i>	Species of concern	None
California Dissanthelium	<i>Dissanthelium californicum</i>	Species of concern	None
California Orcutt Grass	<i>Orcuttia californica</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Catalina Island Mountain-Mahogany	<i>Cercocarpus traskiae</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Coulter's Goldfields	<i>Lasthenia glabrata</i> ssp <i>coulteri</i>	Species of concern	None
Davidson's Bush Mallow	<i>Malacothamnus davidsonii</i>	Species of concern	None
Desert Cymopterus	<i>Cymopterus deserticola</i>	Species of concern	None
Guadalupe Island Lupine	<i>Lupinus guadalupensis</i>	Species of concern	None
Hall's Monardella	<i>Monardella macrantha</i> ssp <i>hallii</i>	None	None
Intermediate Mariposa Lily	<i>Calochortus weedii</i> var <i>intermedius</i>	Species of concern	None
Island Rush-Rose	<i>Helianthemum greenei</i>	Threatened	None
Island Snapdragon	<i>Galvezia speciosa</i>	Species of concern	None
Island Tree Poppy	<i>Dendromecon harfordii</i> var <i>rhamnoides</i>	Species of concern	None
Johnston's Buckwheat	<i>Eriogonum microthecum</i> var <i>johnstonii</i>	Species of concern	None
Lemon Lily	<i>Lilium parryi</i>	Species of concern	None
Los Angeles Sunflower	<i>Helianthus nuttallii</i> ssp <i>parishii</i>	Species of concern	None
Lyon's Pentachaeta	<i>Pentachaeta lyonii</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Many-Flowered Phacelia	<i>Phacelia floribunda</i>	Species of concern	None
Many-Stemmed Dudleya	<i>Dudleya multicaulis</i>	Species of concern	None
Marcrescent Dudleya	<i>Dudleya cymosa</i> ssp <i>marcescens</i>	Threatened	Rare
Mason's Neststraw	<i>Stylocline masonii</i>	Species of concern	None
Mexican Flannelbush	<i>Fremontodendron mexicanum</i>	Endangered	Rare
Mt. Gleason Indian Paintbrush	<i>Castilleja gleasonii</i>	Species of concern	Rare
Nevin's Barberry	<i>Berberis nevinii</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Nevin's Woolly Sunflower	<i>Eriophyllum nevinii</i>	Species of concern	None
Palmer's Grapplinghook	<i>Harpagonella palmeri</i>	Species of concern	None
Palmer's Mariposa Lily	<i>Calochortus palmeri</i> var <i>palmeri</i>	Species of concern	None
Parish's Brittlebush	<i>Atriplex parishii</i>	Species of concern	None
Parish's Gooseberry	<i>Ribes divaricatum</i> var <i>parishii</i>	Species of concern	None
Parry's Spineflower	<i>Chorizanthe parryi</i> var <i>parryi</i>	Species of concern	None
Peirson's Morning-Glory	<i>Calystegia peirsonii</i>	Species of concern	None
Plummer's Mariposa Lily	<i>Calochortus plummerae</i>	Species of concern	None
Rock Creek Broomrape	<i>Orobanche valida</i> ssp <i>valida</i>	Species of concern	None

**Threatened and Endangered Species and Species of Concern
Los Angeles County—Plants**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Salt Marsh Bird's-Beak	<i>Cordylanthus maritimus</i> ssp <i>maritimus</i>	Endangered	Endangered
San Antonio Milk-Vetch	<i>Astragalus lentiginosus</i> var <i>antonius</i>	Species of concern	None
San Clemente Island Bed-straw	<i>Galium catalinense</i> ssp <i>acrispum</i>	Species of concern	Endangered
San Clemente Island Bird's-Foot Trefoil	<i>Lotus argophyllus</i> var <i>adsurgens</i>	Species of concern	Endangered
San Clemente Island Brodiaea	<i>Brodiaea kinkiensis</i>	Species of concern	None
San Clemente Island Buckwheat	<i>Eriogonum giganteum</i> var <i>formosum</i>	Species of concern	None
San Clemente Island Bush Mallow	<i>Malacothamnus clementinus</i>	Endangered	Endangered
San Clemente Island Evening-Primrose	<i>Camissonia guadalupensis</i> ssp <i>clementina</i>	Species of concern	None
San Clemente Island Hazardia	<i>Hazardia cana</i>	Species of concern	None
San Clemente Island Indian Paintbrush	<i>Castilleja grisea</i>	Endangered	Endangered
San Clemente Island Larkspur	<i>Delphinium variegatum</i> ssp <i>kinkiense</i>	Endangered	Endangered
San Clemente Island Lotus	<i>Lotus dendroideus</i> var <i>traskiae</i>	Endangered	Endangered
San Clemente Island Milk-Vetch	<i>Astragalus nevinii</i>	Species of concern	None
San Clemente Island Tritoleia	<i>Triteleia clementina</i>	Species of concern	None
San Clemente Island Woodland Star	<i>Lithophragma maximum</i>	Endangered	Endangered
San Fernando Valley Spineflower	<i>Chorizanthe parryi</i> var <i>Fernandina</i>	Species of concern	None
San Gabriel Bedstraw	<i>Galium grande</i>	Species of concern	None
San Gabriel Linanthus	<i>Linanthus concinnus</i>	Species of concern	None
San Gabriel Manzanita	<i>Arctostaphylos gabrielensis</i>	Species of concern	None
San Gabriel Mountains Dudleya	<i>Dudleya densiflora</i>	Species of concern	None
San Gabriel River Dudleya	<i>Dudleya cymosa</i> ssp <i>crebrifolia</i>	Species of concern	None
San Nicolas Island Lomatium	<i>Lomatium insulare</i>	Species of concern	None
Santa Barbara Morning-Glory	<i>Calystegia sepium</i> ssp <i>binghamiae</i>	None	None
Santa Catalina Figwort	<i>Scrophularia villosa</i>	Species of concern	None
Santa Catalina Island Ironwood	<i>Lyonothamnus floribundus</i> ssp <i>floribundus</i>	Species of concern	None
Santa Catalina Island Manzanita	<i>Arctostaphylos catalinae</i>	Species of concern	None
Santa Catalina Island Monkeyflower	<i>Mimulus traskiae</i>	Species of concern	None
Santa Cruz Island Ironwood	<i>Lyonothamnus floribundus</i> ssp <i>aspleniifolius</i>	Species of concern	None
Santa Cruz Island Rock Cress	<i>Sibara filifolia</i>	Endangered	None
Santa Monica Mountains Dudleya	<i>Dudleya cymosa</i> ssp <i>ovatifolia</i>	Threatened	None
Santa Susana Tarplant	<i>Hemizonia minthornii</i>	Species of concern	Rare
Scalloped Moonwort	<i>Botrychium crenulatum</i>	Species of concern	None

**Threatened and Endangered Species and Species of Concern
Los Angeles County—Plants**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Short-Joint Beavertail	<i>Opuntia basilaris</i> var <i>brachyclada</i>	Species of concern	None
Short-Lobed Broom-Rape	<i>Orobanche parishii</i> ssp <i>brachyloba</i>	Species of concern	None
Slender Mariposa Lily	<i>Calochortus clavatus</i> var <i>gracilis</i>	Species of concern	None
Slender-Horned Spineflower	<i>Dodecahema leptoceras</i>	Endangered	Endangered
South Coast Saltscale	<i>Atriplex pacifica</i>	Species of concern	None
Southern Island Mallow	<i>Lavatera assurgentiflora</i> ssp <i>glabra</i>	Species of concern	None
Southern Tarplant	<i>Hemizonia parryi</i> ssp <i>australis</i>	Species of concern	None
Spreading Navarretia	<i>Navarretia fossalis</i>	Threatened	None
Thorne's Royal Larkspur	<i>Delphinium variegatum</i> ssp <i>thornei</i>	Species of concern	None
Thread-Leaved Brodiaea	<i>Brodiaea filifolia</i>	Threatened	Endangered
Trask's Cryptantha	<i>Cryptantha traskiae</i>	Species of concern	None
Ventura Marsh Milk-Vetch	<i>Astragalus pycnostachyus</i> var <i>lanosissimus</i>	Species of Concern	Candidate

**Threatened and Endangered Species and Species of Concern
Los Angeles County—Animals**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Snails and Slugs			
Catalina Mountainsnail	<i>Radiocentrum</i> (=oreohelix) <i>avalonense</i>	Species of concern	None
Mimic Tryonia (=California Brackishwater Snail)	<i>Tryonia imitator</i>	Species of concern	None
San Clemente Island snail	<i>Micrarionta gabbi</i>	Species of concern	None
Grasshoppers, Katydid, and Crickets			
Santa Monica Shieldback Katydid	<i>Neduba longipennis</i>	Species of concern	None
Beetles			
Dorothy's El Segundo Dune Weevil	<i>Trigonoscuta dorothea dorothea</i>	Species of concern	None
Globose Dune Beetle	<i>Coelus globosus</i>	Species of concern	None
Lange's El Segundo Dune Weevil	<i>Onychobaris langei</i>	Species of concern	None
Sandy Beach Tiger Beetle	<i>Cicindela hirticollis gravida</i>	Species of concern	None
Butterflies and Moths			
El Segundo Blue Butterfly	<i>Euphilotes battoides allyni</i>	Endangered	None
Henne's Eucosman Moth	<i>Eucosma hennei</i>	Species of concern	None
Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly	<i>Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis</i>	Endangered	None
Wandering (=Saltmarsh) Skipper	<i>Panoquina errans</i>	Species of concern	None
Fish			
Arroyo Chub	<i>Gila orcutti</i>	Species of concern	None
Mohave Tui Chub	<i>Gila bicolor mohavensis</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Santa Ana Sucker	<i>Catostomus santaanae</i>	Proposed Threatened	None
Southern Steelhead	<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</i>	Endangered	None
Tidewater Goby	<i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i>	Endangered	None
Unarmored Threespine Stickleback	<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni</i>	Endangered	Endangered

**Threatened and Endangered Species and Species of Concern
Los Angeles County—Animals**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Amphibians			
Arroyo Toad	<i>Bufo microscaphus californicus</i>	Endangered	None
California Red-Legged Frog	<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>	Threatened	None
Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog	<i>Rana muscosa</i>	Species of concern	None
Western Spadefoot	<i>Scaphiopus hammondi</i>	Species of concern	None
Reptiles			
California Horned Lizard	<i>Phrynosoma coronatum frontale</i>	Species of concern	None
Coastal Western Whiptail	<i>Cnemidophorus tigris multicutatus</i>	Species of concern	None
Desert Tortoise	<i>Xerobates agassizii</i>	Threatened	Threatened
Island Night Lizard	<i>Xantusia riversiana</i>	Threatened	None
Orange-Throated Whiptail	<i>Cnemidophorus hyperythrus</i>	Species of concern	None
San Diego Horned Lizard	<i>Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei</i>	Species of concern	None
San Diego Mountain Kingsnake	<i>Lampropeltis zonata pulchra</i>	Species of concern	None
Silvery Legless Lizard	<i>Anniella pulchra pulchra</i>	Species of concern	None
Southwestern Pond Turtle	<i>Clemmys marmorata pallida</i>	Species of concern	None
Two-Striped Garter Snake	<i>Thamnophis hammondi</i>	Species of concern	None
Birds			
Belding's Savannah Sparrow	<i>Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi</i>	Species of concern	Endangered
Burrowing Owl	<i>Athene cunicularia (burrow sites)</i>	Species of concern	None
California Black Rail	<i>Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus</i>	Species of concern	Threatened
California Condor	<i>Gymnogyps californianus</i>	Endangered	Endangered
California Gnatcatcher	<i>Polioptila californica</i>	Threatened	None
California Least Tern	<i>Sterna antillarum browni (nesting colony)</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Least Bell's Vireo	<i>Vireo bellii pusillus (nesting)</i>	Endangered	Endangered
San Clemente Loggerhead Shrike	<i>Lanius ludovicianus mearnsi</i>	Endangered	None
San Clemente Sage Sparrow	<i>Amphispiza belli clementeae</i>	Threatened	None
Swainson's Hawk	<i>Buteo swainsoni (nesting)</i>	None	Threatened
Tricolored Blackbird	<i>Agelaius tricolor (nesting colony)</i>	Species of concern	None
Western Snowy Plover	<i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus (nesting)</i>	Threatened	None
Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo	<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis (nesting)</i>	None	Endangered
Mammals			
Island Fox	<i>Urocyon littoralis</i>	Species of concern	Threatened
Mohave Ground Squirrel	<i>Spermophilus mohavensis</i>	Species of concern	Threatened
Pacific Pocket Mouse	<i>Perognathus longimembris pacificus</i>	Endangered	None
San Diego Desert Woodrat	<i>Neotoma lepida intermedia</i>	Species of concern	None
San Joaquin Pocket Mouse	<i>Perognathus inornatus inornatus</i>	Species of concern	None
Santa Catalina Shrew	<i>Sorex ornatus willetti</i>	Species of concern	None
Tehachapi Pocket Mouse	<i>Perognathus alticola inexpectatus</i>	Species of concern	None

**Threatened and Endangered Species and Species of Concern
Los Angeles County—Animals**

<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Scientific Name</i>	<i>Federal Status</i>	<i>State Status</i>
<p>Source: California Dept. of Fish & Game and Los Angeles Almanac</p> <p>The only known populations of Unarmored Threespine Stickleback, a fish, are in the Santa Clara River's drainage to the Los Angeles River and in San Diego County.</p> <p>The Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly, originally found only in Palos Verdes Peninsula, was thought extinct until it was rediscovered in San Pedro in 1994.</p> <p>The El Segundo Blue Butterfly is found only on two acres on a Chevron Oil Refinery and at the western end of LAX.</p> <p>The Gray Whale migrates along the west coasts of Mexico, the U.S., and Canada. It is federally protected.</p>			

APPENDIX H

Potential Indicator Species

To gauge the success of habitat linkages, it is possible to identify species that can serve as sensitive indicators of functional connectivity. Using the approach of Noss (1991; pp. 227-246 in K. Kohm, ed. *Balancing on the Brink of Extinction*, Island Press) and Caro and O'Doherty (1999; *Conservation Biology* 13:805-814) species can be described with the following categories:

- 1) *Umbrellas*—species whose habitat area and quality requirements encapsulate the needs of an array of other species.
- 2) *Flagships*—charismatic species that attract the attention and imagination of the general public.
- 3) *Ecosystem Health Indicators*—species sensitive to and indicative of anthropogenic disturbances to ecological functions.
- 4) *Population Health Indicators*—predators whose population health provides a measure of the health of populations of their prey and of associated ecological functions.
- 5) *Keystone Species*—species whose impact on the ecosystem is large and disproportionately large for their abundance.

Using these categories, the following species have been identified¹ as useful indicators for conservation planning at the landscape and regional scales within the watersheds:

- 1) Steelhead (wild rainbow trout): Flagship and umbrella; encompasses requirements for Pacific lamprey and for lower elevation fish species.
- 2) Unarmored three-spine stickleback: Umbrella; encompasses requirements for lower elevation arroyo chub, Santa Ana sucker, and Santa Ana speckled dace.
- 3) Arroyo toad: Ecosystem health indicator for “fluctuating hydrological, geological, and ecological processes operating in riparian ecosystems and adjacent uplands” (USFWS 1999, Arroyo Toad Recovery Plan).
- 4) California red-legged frog: Ecosystem health indicator for riparian habitats and adjacent aquatic and upland systems.
- 5) Southwestern pond turtle: Ecosystem health indicator for upper watershed tributaries.
- 6) Yellow warbler: Umbrella species for high quality riparian habitat, shaped by natural fluvial processes.
- 7) Least Bell’s vireo: Ecosystem health indicator and possible umbrella species for riparian habitats with well-developed overstories, understories, and low densities of aquatic and herbaceous cover (USFWS 2000, Biological Opinion on the Effects of Ongoing Forest Activities that May Affect Listed Riparian Species on the Cleveland National Forest, the Los Padres National Forest, the San Bernardino National Forest, and Angeles National Forest in Southern California).
- 8) Southwestern willow flycatcher: Ecosystem health indicator of riparian habitat with dense growths of willows, *Baccharis*, arrowweed, buttonbush, or other plants of similar structure. Although overlapping, significant differences in habitat requirements with least Bell’s vireo are probable (USFWS 2000, *Ibid.*).
- 9) Arboreal salamander: Umbrella for high quality oak, walnut, and sycamore woodland habitats, including connectivity to riparian areas.

¹ Noss, Reed, *Task 2: Assessment of the Feasibility of Wildlife Corridors, List of Species to be Addressed, Recommendations of Habitat Enhancement Opportunities for Migratory Birds and for Additional Information to be Collected, and Map of Corridor Opportunities. Report to the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council*, September 3, 2001

- 10) Oak titmouse: Umbrella for woodlands that may be somewhat fragmented, but still offer significant habitat value for species less affected by loss of terrestrial connectivity.
- 11) Coast horned lizard: Ecosystem health indicator for certain aspects of alluvial fan and coastal sage scrubs.
- 12) Lesser nighthawk: Umbrella for certain aspects of alluvial fan sage scrub, especially areal extent.
- 13) Plummer's mariposa lily: Ecosystem health indicator and tentative flagship for alluvial fan sage scrub and chaparral.
- 14) Cactus wren: Flagship for alluvial fan and coastal sage scrub with stands of *Opuntia* cactus.
- 15) Greater roadrunner: Flagship for coastal and alluvial fan sage scrub and grassland habitat connectivity.
- 16) California gnatcatcher: Tentative umbrella for restoration of coastal sage scrub quantity, quality, and connectivity.
- 17) Grasshopper sparrow: Umbrella for grassland habitats.
- 18) California quail: Flagship for upland habitat connectivity.
- 19) Great blue heron: Flagship and potential ecosystem health indicator for mature forest (riparian and otherwise, for rookeries) and aquatic habitats.
- 20) Bobcat: Population health indicator for prey species; flagship and potential umbrella for landscape-scale connectivity.
- 21) Gray fox: Population health indicator for prey species; flagship and potential umbrella for landscape-scale connectivity.
- 22) Coyote: Population health indicator for prey species; flagship and potential umbrella for landscape-scale connectivity; documented keystone species for controlling opportunistic mesopredators (e.g., feral cat, raccoon, opossum, gray fox) and thereby increasing songbird nesting success (see Crooks and Soulé 1999, *Nature* 400:563-566).
- 23) Black bear: Flagship and potential umbrella for landscape-scale connectivity; possible ecosystem health indicator for forests.
- 24) Mountain lion: Population health indicator for prey species and possible keystone species; flagship and umbrella for regional-scale connectivity.

It may not be possible, given foreseeable funding scenarios, to conduct detailed population censuses, habitat modeling, and population viability modeling for all 24 of these species. Nevertheless, some level of effort should be devoted to determining the distribution and population trends of these species and opportunities for more intensive research should be seized whenever possible.

In addition, a comprehensive conservation strategy for the study region should protect sites occupied by species ranked as critically imperiled globally (G1) or imperiled globally (G2) by The Nature Conservancy and the Association for Biodiversity Information. Examples of G1 species in the study region are Munz's onion (*Allium munzii*), slender-horned spineflower (*Dodecabema leptoceras*), Laguna beach dudleya (*Dudleya stolonifera*), Lyon's pentachaeta (*Pentachaeta lyonii*), and Lange's El Segundo dune weevil (*Onychobaris langei*).

The occurrences of these and other imperiled species are mapped in California by the California Natural Diversity Data Base. These are local-scale species (Poiani et al. 2000, *Ibid.*) and many of their habitats are isolated; hence, they would be neglected by a conservation plan focused largely on riparian networks or wildlife corridors. Importantly, because these species are mostly narrow endemics, their global survival depends on conservation actions taken in the watersheds. In addition, many narrowly restricted G1 and G2 plant communities—for example, walnut forest and valley needlegrass grassland—occur in the watersheds and require protection.