



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 467-4201
www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



Via Electronic Mail Only

January 26, 2022

Paul Cobian
City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
1149 S. Broadway 9th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90015
Paul.Cobian@lacity.org

Subject: Negative Declaration for the D.C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant: Japanese Garden Discharge Reuse Project, SCH #2021120230, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Cobian:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed a Negative Declaration (ND) from the City of Los Angeles (City) for the D.C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant: Japanese Garden Discharge Reuse Project (Project). CDFW appreciates the opportunity to provide comments regarding aspects of the Project that could affect fish and wildlife resources and be subject to CDFW's regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

CDFW's Role

CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State [Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subdivision (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, § 15386, subdivision (a)]. CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (Id., § 1802). Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect State fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW is also submitting comments as a Responsible Agency under CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381). CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code, including lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 *et seq.*). Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take", as defined by State law, of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 *et seq.*), or CESA-listed rare plant pursuant to the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA; Fish & G. Code, § 1900 *et seq.*), CDFW recommends the Project proponent obtain appropriate authorization under the Fish and Game Code.

Paul Cobian
City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
January 26, 2022
Page 2 of 11

Project Description and Summary

Objective: The Project proposes to cease all discharge of recycled water (Subject Recycled Water), up to 4,820 acre-feet per year (4.5 million gallons per day), from the Japanese Garden Lake located in the Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant (WRP).

A significant majority of the Subject Recycled Water produced at the WRP is directed through a network of pipes to various water features located in the Sepulveda Basin. The flowthrough process at these various water features serves to maintain water quality and prevent fish kills, odor problems, and algae blooms. Recycled water from these water features, which include the Japanese Garden Lake, Lake Balboa, and Wildlife Lake, discharges to the Los Angeles River at various locations. Currently, discharge from the Japanese Garden Lake enters a 108-inch storm drain, which discharges downstream of the Sepulveda Dam to a concrete-lined box-channel portion of the Los Angeles River.

Under the proposed Project, Subject Recycled Water in the Japanese Garden Lake would be rerouted back to the WRP for additional treatment (Subject Advanced Treated Recycled Water). Subject Advanced Treated Recycled Water would be provided to the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and conveyed via an existing pipeline system to recharge the San Fernando Groundwater Basin. Groundwater replenishment would be accomplished by spreading the Subject Advanced Treated Recycled Water at the existing Hansen Spreading Grounds and Pacoima Spreading Grounds, both located approximately five miles northeast of the WRP. Subsequent extraction of this groundwater from the San Fernando Groundwater Basin will offset the purchase of imported water supplies with local groundwater.

To facilitate the Project, a new diversion facility consisting of a new valve and new pipeline would be constructed. All activity would be located within the Japanese Garden and WRP property line. The new valve would be installed at the outlet of the Japanese Garden Lake. From the new valve, approximately 80 feet of new buried pipeline would be installed to divert the Subject Recycled Water flow through to the Japanese Garden Lake back to the headworks of the WRP. Construction of the new valve is expected to take two to three months within the summer months of 2022. Construction would occur in four phases as follows:

- Phase 1: Demolish and remove existing surface or near surface improvement materials (e.g., roughly 1,200 square feet of asphalt and concrete);
- Phase 2: Excavate and support installation of the trenches for the diversion; install diversion pipeline;
- Phase 3: Install diversion pipeline including connections to the existing intake and drain pipelines, and backfilling trenches with structural backfill (approximately 30 cubic yards) and/or with stockpiled excavated materials; and,
- Phase 4: Restoration activities including replacement of concrete and asphalt surfaces and restoration of site landscaping.

Location: The WRP is located at 6100 Woodley Avenue in the Encino and Van Nuys communities of the City of Los Angeles. The WRP is located within the Sepulveda Basin, located immediately northwest of the intersection of Highway 101 and I-405. The Japanese Garden occupies about 6.5 acres in the northwest corner of the WRP.

Paul Cobian
City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
January 26, 2022
Page 3 of 11

Comments and Recommendations

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the City in adequately identifying, avoiding, and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct, and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. Editorial comments or other suggestions are also included to improve the environmental document. CDFW recommends the measures or revisions below be included in a science-based monitoring program that contains adaptive management strategies as part of the Project's CEQA mitigation, monitoring, and reporting program (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6; CEQA Guidelines, § 15097).

Specific Comments

Comment: Impacts on Nesting Birds

Issue: The Project's environmental document does not discuss the Project's potential to impact nesting birds.

Specific impacts: Project construction and activities during the nesting bird season could cause nesting birds to abandon their nests and a decrease in feeding frequency. This could result in loss of fertile eggs and nestlings.

Why impacts would occur: According to eBird, there are ten bird hotspots in the Sepulveda Basin. One of these hotspots is in the Japanese Garden (*Sepulveda Basin-Japanese Garden* hotspot) (eBird 2021). At least 83 species of birds have been observed at the *Sepulveda Basin-Japanese Garden* hotspot (eBird 2021). According to page 4-8 of the ND, the Japanese Garden is described as a "heavily vegetated area...with many mature trees, ornamental plantings, and native vegetation." There is a possibility that birds may nest in the Japanese Garden. Moreover, there is a possibility that birds may nest in trees and vegetation adjacent to the Japanese Garden on the west, southwest, and east.

Any birds nesting within and adjacent to the construction of the new diversion facility could be impacted because the Project would "involve temporary effects to ornamental vegetation during construction" (ND page 4-8). Construction of the new diversion facility would overlap with the bird nesting season which typically occurs from February 1 (as early as January 1 for raptors) through August 31 in the Project region. According to Table 2.2-2 in the ND, construction would require demolition, trenching, and ground-disturbing (grading, paving, landscaping) activities facilitated by large equipment such as an excavator, loader, water truck, dump truck, crane, paver, roller, and a concrete saw. Construction would create elevated levels of noise, human activity, dust, ground vibrations, and vegetation disturbance. In addition, nesting birds could be impacted by ambient nighttime lighting since the Project may require construction activity at night (ND page 2-6). These activities occurring near potential nests could cause birds to abandon their nests and a decrease in feeding frequency, both resulting in the loss of fertile eggs or nestlings. Accordingly, the Project would have an impact on nesting birds.

Evidence impact would be significant: Nests of all birds and raptors are protected under State laws and regulations, including Fish and Game Code, sections 3503 and 3503.5. Fish and Game Code section 3503 states, "It is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird." Fish and Game code section 3503.5 prohibits the take, possession, or destruction of birds-of-prey and their nests or eggs. Also, take or possession of migratory

Paul Cobian
City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
January 26, 2022
Page 4 of 11

nongame birds designated in the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 is prohibited under Fish and Game Code section 3513. As such, impacts on nesting birds and raptors, either directly or indirectly through nest abandonment, reproductive suppression, or loss of occupied nesting habitat, would be a significant impact absent appropriate mitigation. Inadequate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for impacts on nesting birds and raptors will result in the Project continuing to have a substantial adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status by CDFW or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s):

Recommendation #1: CDFW recommends the City include an evaluation of the Project's impact on nesting birds in the ND. The ND should provide measures consistent with Mitigation Measures #1 through #3 to avoid the Project's potentially significant impacts on nesting birds to reduce potential effects to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure #1: To protect nesting birds that may occur in the Japanese Garden and areas adjacent to the construction site, construction of the new diversion facility and use of any construction-related nighttime lighting should occur between September 1 through January 31, outside of the nesting bird season.

Mitigation Measure #2: If construction must occur during the bird nesting season, a qualified biologist should conduct a nesting bird survey no more than 7 days prior to the beginning of any ground and vegetation disturbing activities. The qualified biologist should survey all potential nesting, roosting, and perching sites within a minimum 500-foot radius from the construction site. If Project activities are delayed or suspended for more than 7 days during the nesting bird season over the estimated two to three months of construction, a qualified biologist should repeat nesting bird surveys before any activities can recommence.

Mitigation Measure #3: If nesting birds are identified, the qualified biologist should establish a no-disturbance buffer of a minimum of 300 feet around active nests. No-disturbance buffers should be increased, if necessary, to protect the nesting birds. No-disturbance buffers should be maintained until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist determines that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival.

Additional Recommendations

Recommendation #2: HEC-RAS Hydraulic Modeling

The ND relies on the results of HEC-RAS hydraulic modeling conducted for the proposed Project to evaluate the effects to biological resources. The HEC-RAS model was adapted from the Los Angeles River Environmental Flows Study (Stein et al. 2021). The HEC-RAS modeling conducted for the Project deviates from the models used in the Los Angeles River Environmental Flows Study in two aspects. First, the HEC-RAS model conducted for the proposed Project used flow data collected from a period between January 2008 through June 2019. The models used in the Los Angeles River Environmental Flows Study were based on hydrologic conditions (or baseline conditions) defined as the flows and operations (wastewater reclamation plants) that occurred during water year (WY) 2011 to 2017. Second, the HEC-RAS model conducted for the proposed Project analyzes flow based on three scenarios: lowest

Paul Cobian
City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
January 26, 2022
Page 5 of 11

monthly mean daily flow (April), highest monthly mean daily flow (January), and lowest average monthly mean daily flow (August). The Los Angeles River Environmental Flows Study analyzes flow based on two seasons: wet season (October through March) or dry season (April through September).

CDFW recommends the City provide additional clarification and justification in the ND for more complete disclosure as to how the City used HEC-RAS hydraulic modeling to evaluate the Project's effects to biological resources. CDFW recommends the City revise the ND to:

- clarify if the flow data from January 2008 through June 2019 is based on calendar year or water year (October 1 through September 30);
- explain why HEC-RAS modeling did not use hydrologic conditions consistent with the Los Angeles River Environmental Flows Study (i.e., WY 2011 to 2017);
- explain why using hydrologic conditions from January 2008 through June 2019 instead of WY 2011 to 2017 is adequate to compare baseline conditions against conditions when the Project is implemented;
- explain why HEC-RAS modeling evaluates flow based on means of all 12 months instead of flow based on means within a range of months during the wet (October through March) and dry season (April through September);
- explain if the three modeled scenarios coincide with the wet and dry season as defined in the Los Angeles River Environmental Flows Study; and,
- clarify whether the ND evaluates Project impacts on biological resources based on wet and dry season flow.

Recommendation #3: Threshold of Significance

CDFW appreciates that the ND provides a quantitative evaluation of the Project's effects on discharge, maximum depth, and wetted perimeter along the Los Angeles River. CDFW also appreciates that the City evaluated the Project's cumulative effects on the Los Angeles River. However, it is unclear what thresholds the City used to determine that these effects on the Los Angeles River are "minor" and "not noticeable" as described in the MND, which resulted in a determination that the Project has no impact or less than significant impact on biological resources. The ND does not provide a qualitative or quantitative definition for "minor" and "not noticeable" nor does the ND explain why the criteria or threshold for "minor" and "not noticeable" are appropriate for determining the Project's level of significance. In addition, the ND does not explain if "minor" and "not noticeable" were derived from a statistical exercise comparing current and post-Project conditions.

CDFW recommends the City revise the ND to explain what defines "minor" and "not noticeable" and how these definitions were derived based on any criteria, thresholds, or statistics. A threshold of significance should be an identifiable quantitative, qualitative, or performance level (CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.7). The ND should explain how compliance with those thresholds means that the Project's impacts are less than significant [CEQA Guidelines, § 15064(b)(2)]. The ND should explain whether these thresholds have been adopted for general use by the City as part of the City's environmental review process, which must be adopted by ordinance, resolution, rule, or regulation, and developed through a public review process and be supported by substantial evidence (CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.7). The ND explain disclose whether these thresholds have been previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies or recommended by experts (CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.7).

Paul Cobian
 City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
 January 26, 2022
 Page 6 of 11

Recommendation #4: Minimum Threshold Requirements for Willows (*Salix* genus) and Cattail (*Typha* genus) Under Medium Probability Conditions

CDFW recommends the City provide clarification and additional discussion of the Project's impacts and cumulative impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive communities in the Glendale Narrows stretch of the Los Angeles River. First, page 4-45 in the ND states, "flows under the average dry weather condition with the proposed Project are predicted to be 49.7 cfs and under the lowest dry weather condition to be 28.5 cfs. These predicted flows are above the thresholds that indicate support of suitable habitat for both survival and growth of cattails throughout the Glendale Narrows stretch of the Los Angeles River." According to Table 4.6-3, summer flow conditions required to provide suitable habitat for survival of cattails is 84-1,968 cfs at the LA14 reporting node and 77-568 cfs at the Glendale reporting node. The predicted flows of 49.7 cfs and 28.5 cfs are below the summer flow conditions required at the LA14 and Glendale reporting nodes. CDFW recommends the City provide additional discussion and clarification as to why predicted flows of 49.7 cfs and 28.5 cfs would not result in significant impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive communities. In addition, CDFW recommends the City provide an evaluation of predicted wet season flows in relation to wet season flow conditions required to provide suitable habitat for survival and growth of cattails and willows.

Second, under section 5.4.4, CDFW recommends the City provide a discussion on whether the Project would have a cumulative impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive communities. The discussion should evaluate cumulative flow reductions during the wet and dry season in relation to wet and dry season flow conditions required to provide suitable habitat for survival and growth of willows and cattails.

Finally, CDFW recommends the City clarify where/how values in Table 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 were derived and why some of the values are inconsistent with the flow conditions derived via the [LA River Environmental Flows Dashboard](#) (SCCWRP 2021). For example, using the *Flow Range Determination* tool, the dry season baseflow range for a medium probability of willow adult survival at the Glendale node is 23-355 cfs. This value differs from 23-40,590 cfs in Table 4.6-2.

Recommendation #5: Fish and Game Code Section 1602

CDFW exercises its regulatory authority as provided by Fish and Game Code section 1600 et seq. to conserve fish and wildlife resources which includes rivers, streams, or lakes and associated plant communities. Fish and Game Code section 1602 requires any person, state or local governmental agency, or public utility to notify CDFW prior to beginning any activity that may do one or more of the following:

- Divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream, or lake¹;
- Change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake;
- Use material from any river, stream, or lake; or,
- Deposit or dispose of material into any river, stream, or lake.

¹ "Any river, stream, or lake" includes those that are dry for periods of time (ephemeral/episodic) as well as those that flow year-round (perennial). This includes ephemeral streams, desert washes, and watercourses with a subsurface flow. It may also apply to work undertaken within the flood plain of a water body.

Paul Cobian
City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
January 26, 2022
Page 7 of 11

CDFW requires a Lake or Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement when a project activity may substantially adversely affect fish and wildlife resources. If the Project substantially diverts or obstructs the natural flow of any river, stream, or lake, the City should notify CDFW regarding the activity pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1602. Please visit CDFW's [Lake and Streambed Alteration Program](#) webpage for information about LSA Notification and online submittal through the Environmental Permit Information Management System (EPIMS) Permitting Portal (CDFW 2022).

Filing Fees

The Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the City of Los Angeles and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the fee is required for the underlying Project approval to be operative, vested, and final (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089).

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Project to assist the City of Los Angeles in adequately analyzing and minimizing/mitigating impacts to biological resources. CDFW requests an opportunity to review and comment on any response that the City of Los Angeles has to our comments and to receive notification of any forthcoming hearing date(s) for the Project [CEQA Guidelines, § 15073(e)]. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Ruby Kwan-Davis, Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist), at Ruby.Kwan-Davis@wildlife.ca.gov or (562) 619-2230.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

B6E58CFE24724F5...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Environmental Program Manager I
South Coast Region

ec: CDFW

Erinn Wilson-Olgin, Los Alamitos – Erinn.Wilson-Olgin@wildlife.ca.gov
Victoria Tang, Los Alamitos – Victoria.Tang@wildlife.ca.gov
Ruby Kwan-Davis, Los Alamitos – Ruby.Kwan-Davis@wildlife.ca.gov
Felicia Silva, Los Alamitos – Felicia.Silva@wildlife.ca.gov
Julisa Portugal, Los Alamitos – Julisa.Portugal@wildlife.ca.gov
Frederic (Fritz) Rieman, Los Alamitos – Frederic.Rieman@wildlife.ca.gov
Cindy Hailey, San Diego – Cindy.Hailey@wildlife.ca.gov
CEQA Program Coordinator, Sacramento – CEQACommentLetters@wildlife.ca.gov
State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research – State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

Paul Cobian
City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
January 26, 2022
Page 8 of 11

References:

- [CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. Lake and Streambed Alteration Program. Available from: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA>.
- eBird. 2021. Explore Hotspots. [Accessed 29 December 2021.] Accessed at: <https://ebird.org/hotspots?hs=L835992&yr=all&m=>
- [SCCWRP] Southern California Coastal Water Research Project. 2021. LA River Environmental Flows Dashboard. Available from: https://sccwrp.shinyapps.io/lar_eflows_shinyapp/
- Stein, E.D., Wolfand, J., Abdi, R., Irving, K., Hennon, V., Taniguchi-Quan, K., Philippus, D., Tinoco, A., Rust, A., Gallo, E., Bell, C., and T.S. Hogue. 2021. *Process and Decision Support Tools for Evaluating Flow Management Targets to Support Aquatic Life and Recreational Beneficial Uses of the Los Angeles River*. Southern California Coastal Water Research Project Technical Report 1196. April. Available from: <https://www.sccwrp.org/about/research-areas/eco hydrology/los-angeles-river-flows-project/>



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
 DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
 South Coast Region
 3883 Ruffin Road
 San Diego, CA 92123
 (858) 467-4201
www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



Attachment A: Draft Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan

Biological Resources (BIO)			
Mitigation Measure (MM) or Recommendation (REC)		Timing	Responsible Party
REC-1 Impacts on Nesting Birds	The City should include an evaluation of the Project's impact on nesting birds in the Project's CEQA document. The Project's CEQA document should provide measures consistent with Mitigation Measures #1 through #3 to avoid the Project's potentially significant impacts on nesting birds to reduce potential effects to less than significant.	Prior to finalizing/adopting CEQA document	City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment (City)
MM-BIO-1 Impacts on Nesting Birds	To protect nesting birds that may occur in the Japanese Garden and areas adjacent to the construction site, construction of the new diversion facility and use of any construction-related nighttime lighting shall occur between September 1 through January 31, outside of the nesting bird season.	Prior to starting Project construction and activities	City
MM-BIO-2 Impacts on Nesting Birds	If construction must occur during the bird nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey no more than 7 days prior to the beginning of any ground and vegetation disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall survey all potential nesting, roosting, and perching sites within a minimum 500-foot radius from the construction site. If Project activities are delayed or suspended for more than 7 days during the nesting bird season over the estimated two to three months of construction, a qualified biologist shall repeat nesting bird surveys before any activities can recommence.	No more than 7 days prior to beginning or restarting of any ground and vegetation disturbing activities	City
MM-BIO-3 Impacts on Nesting Birds	If nesting birds are identified, the qualified biologist shall establish a no-disturbance buffer of a minimum of 300 feet around active nests. No-disturbance buffers shall be increased, if necessary, to protect the nesting birds. No-disturbance buffers shall be maintained until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified	Prior to and During Project construction and activities	City

Paul Cobian
 City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
 January 26, 2022
 Page 10 of 11

	biologist determines that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival.		
REC-2 HEC-RAS Hydraulic Modeling	<p>The City should provide additional clarification and justification in the ND for more complete disclosure as to how the City used HEC-RAS hydraulic modeling to evaluate the Project's effects to biological resources. The City should revise the ND to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarify if the flow data from January 2008 through June 2019 is based on calendar year or water year (October 1 through September 30); explain why HEC-RAS modeling did not use hydrologic conditions consistent with the Los Angeles River Environmental Flows Study (i.e., WY 2011 to 2017); explain why using hydrologic conditions from January 2008 through June 2019 instead of WY 2011 to 2017 is adequate to compare baseline conditions against conditions when the Project is implemented; explain why HEC-RAS modeling evaluates flow based on means of all 12 months instead of flow based on means within a range of months during the wet (October through March) and dry season (April through September); explain if the three modeled scenarios coincide with the wet and dry season as defined in the Los Angeles River Environmental Flows Study; and, clarify whether the ND evaluates Project impacts on biological resources based on wet and dry season flow. 	Prior to finalizing/adopting CEQA document	City
REC-3-Threshold of Significance	The City should revise the Project's CEQA document to provide a discussion for what the City defines as "minor" and "not noticeable" changes to the Los Angeles River. A threshold of significance should be an identifiable quantitative, qualitative, or performance level. The Project's CEQA document should also explain how compliance with those thresholds means that the Project's impacts are less than significant. The Project's CEQA document should disclose whether these thresholds have been adopted for general use by the City as part of the City's environmental review process.	Prior to finalizing/adopting CEQA document	City

Paul Cobian
 City of Los Angeles - LA Sanitation & Environment
 January 26, 2022
 Page 11 of 11

	The Project's CEQA document should disclose whether these thresholds have been previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies or recommended by experts.		
REC-4- Minimum Threshold Requirements for Willows (<i>Salix</i> genus) and Cattail (<i>Typha</i> genus) Under Medium Probability Conditions	<p>The City should provide clarification and additional discussion of the Project's impacts and cumulative impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive communities in the Glendale Narrows stretch of the Los Angeles River. The City should provide additional discussion and clarification as to why predicted flows of 49.7 cfs and 28.5 cfs would not result in significant impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive communities. In addition, the City should provide an evaluation of predicted wet season flows in relation to wet season flow conditions required to provide suitable habitat for survival and growth of cattails and willows.</p> <p>The City should provide a discussion on whether the Project would have a cumulative impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive communities. The discussion should evaluate cumulative flow reductions during the wet and dry season in relation to wet and dry season flow conditions required to provide suitable habitat for survival and growth of willows and cattails.</p> <p>Finally, the City should clarify where/how values in Table 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 were derived and why some of the values are inconsistent with the flow conditions derived via the LA River Environmental Flows Dashboard.</p>	Prior to finalizing/adopting CEQA document	City
REC-5- Fish and Game Code Section 1602	If the Project substantially diverts or obstructs the natural flow of any river, stream, or lake, the City should notify CDFW regarding the activity pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1602.	Prior to starting Project construction and activities	City