From: Grace Yu
To: Chirdon, Matthew@Wildlife
Cc: Mari (Schroeder) Quillman; Veronica Mardis; Ken Zimmer; Belinda Kwan; Pat Wood
Subject: RE: Acreage and Habitats in Big Tujunga
Date: Monday, October 17, 2016 5:26:40 PM
Attachments: CDFG 1600-2008-0253-R5 jj rev td_FINAL.pdf
Thompson Creek Dam 20002308 - CDFG - Seismic Modification Streambed Alteration Letter.pdf

---

Hi Matt,

Those are good questions. As you know there's a lot of history with BTWMA and all the material will take some time to get through. In terms of how we go about this, I think we will need to take the following steps:

1) Agree to which projects used BTWMA credits ← the ledger is my final list unless CDFW has projects that I'm missing
2) Determine how many and what kind of credits CDFW will allocate ← Mari is working on a writeup to assist CDFW with an apples to apples comparison of past to current conditions.
3) Determine/Agree each project's type of credit usage ← this will require research into old project folders which I will start compiling
4) Deduct project credits from CDFW allocated credits
5) Determine if what's remaining is sufficient for Devil's Gate offsite mitigation needs

Below are my initial responses to your questions in green.

Grace Yu
[626.458.6139]

From: Chirdon, Matthew@Wildlife [mailto:Matthew.Chirdon@wildlife.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2016 3:21 PM
To: Grace Yu
Subject: RE: Acreage and Habitats in Big Tujunga

Thank you Grace,

This ledger looks pretty good. I had some comments.

A. For Thompson Creek Seismic Rehabilitation Project I have 2.0 acres in debit. When I looked at the SAA I see Condition 42 that stipulates 1.0 acre offsite or 2.0 acres of invasive removal at a location to be determined. I don't see the assessment of 1.7 acres. Any thoughts from the County on how 1.7 acres was proposed as off site compensatory mitigation? I'm not 100% sure how we landed on 1.7 acres, but this was noted in a SAA permit (see attached). I have records that we opted to conduct the 2.0 acre exotic removal as opposed to off-site mitigation (also attached). This will be a part of my step 3 to do more digging in old project files to see if I can track down the 1.7 acres.
B. Santa Anita Dam and Reservoir Riser Modification and Sediment Removal Project required 6.9 acres of Sycamore/Coast Live Oak restoration at BTMA. This should have been debited from the 11.7 acre "Restoration Area". The question is where does the 6.9 AC debit come out of, which is what I was talking about last week (see below)? I'm not sure where your reference of the 11.7 acre Restoration Area comes from? This will go along with Step 2 for Mari to better define the past and current habitat at BTWMA so that we can do an apples to apples comparison.
C. How many acres are within the Big Tujunga Ponds? When the original Biological Resources Assessment and Functional Analysis was performed in April 1998 it indicated that the BTMA was around 220 acres and the Big T Ponds (LA Co. Rec. Dept.) were around 27 acres. This resulted in reports generated on 247 acres. In 2009 updated mapping including trails was done to determine the proper amount of acreage to exclude. Based on 2009 mapping when you include the riparian areas (open water (aquatic-stream), SWS, and RAFSS), RA, developed areas (trails and access roads, non-restored), and exclude the Big T. Ponds (which were mapped at 12.874 AC) the total area is almost 226 acres (see attached). Should we assume another 19 acres should be

added to approx. area of Big T. Ponds? The Tujunga Ponds is 12.8 acres. We are excluding the Tujunga Ponds from our BTWMA acreage because LACFCD does not own those lands. However, we have performed significant enhancement to the Tujunga Ponds and hope that that effort will considered in the final CDFW credit allotment. This discussion is included in Mari's writeup for Step 2.

D. A different way of figuring this out is there a discrepancy between BTMA's Fee/title and CE? 1.) how many acres are protected by the CE by Los Angeles County acting through its Dept. of Public Works/FCD and of this how many are excepted from protection by (easement, title, etc.) around 207-209 AC, correct?; AND 2.) How many acres are contained within the area owned in Fee by Los Angeles County? If this extra acreage is on the Fee/Title owned by LA County (and not part of LA Co. Rec. parcel) then we may have the answer. Mari's writeup for Step 2 should fully address your concerns on this topic. The writeup is currently in our review and I hope to have something submitted to you next week.

P.S. * Side bar thought* were the 11.7 acres in Restoration Area accounted for in CDFW's (formerly CDFG) Sept. 1998 Letter discussing the existence of 8 acres aquatic, 103 acres riparian, & 96 acres alluvial sage scrub…perhaps a low priority issue if all acreage is accounted for between BTMA and Big T. ponds.

MC
P: 805.640.1165

Every Californian should conserve water. Find out how at:

SaveOurWater.com · Drought.CA.gov

From: Grace Yu [mailto:GYU@dpw.lacounty.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2016 1:28 PM
To: Chirdon, Matthew@Wildlife
Subject: RE: Acreage and Habitats in Big Tujunga

Hi Matt,

I tried to send you the following email with attached permits. It got rejected from your IT. I'm hoping this one goes through.

Grace Yu
[626.458.6139]

From: Grace Yu
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2016 1:16 PM
To: Matthew Chirdon
Cc: Veronica Mardis; Ken Zimmer; Mari (Schroeder) Quillman
Subject: RE: Acreage and Habitats in Big Tujunga

Hi Matt,

As requested, below is the list of projects that have used the Big Tujunga Mitigation Area credits. I've also attached copies of the permits. Take a look and we can discuss more when you're ready. Thanks.

Project Utilizing Mitigation Credits	Permit No Date	Credit Acres
100 Reaches Channel Clearing	5-07 6-99†	62.7

	(09/22/1999)	
Friendly Woods Drain	**5-050-00** (05/11/2000)	1.6
Thompson Creek Dam Seismic Rehabilitation Project	**5-086-00 (rev2)** (6/28/2000)	1.7
Big Dalton Dam Subdrain Extension	**R5-2002.0435 (rev1)** (06/02/2003)	3.34
Live Oak Reservoir Post-Fire Sediment Removal	**1600-2004-0111-R5** (07/23/2004)	2
Devils Gate Reservoir Outlet Works Sediment Removal	**1600-2006-0204-R5** (11/16/2006)	2.68
Puddingstone Diversion Reservoir Post-Fire Sediment Removal	**R5-2002-0437 (rev1)** (03/20/2003)	5.1
San Dimas Reservoir Post-Fire Sediment Removal	**R5-2002-0436** (06/11/2003)	5.1
Burro Canyon Sediment Placement Site Debris Basins	**R5-2002-0438** (11/24/2003)	0.3
Big Tujunga Dam Rehabilitation Project	**1600-2006-0029-R5** (02/27/2006)	0.43
Santa Anita Dam and Reservoir Riser Modification and Sediment Removal	**1600-2008-0173-R5** (2/25/2010)	6.9

† The mitigation ratio resulting in the 62.7 Ac figure was identified in the August 20, 1999 Initial Study prepared by the State Water Resources Control Board (Pg 3-12)

Grace Yu
[626.458.6139]

From: Chirdon, Matthew@Wildlife [mailto:Matthew.Chirdon@wildlife.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 9:39 AM
To: Grace Yu
Cc: Veronica Mardis; Ryan Virgin; Ken Zimmer; Mari (Schroeder) Quillman
Subject: Acreage and Habitats in Big Tujunga

Hi Grace:

I have been looking into the available acreage and types of habitat at Big Tujunga Mitigation Area (BTMA).

1. I went to the recorded easement and pulled the acreages from the legal description and available plat map, and I then went to CDFW's (aka CDFG) September 29, 1998 letter in response to DPW's Mitigation Request Letter of September 2, 1998. These two comparisons are in columns A-B & D-E respectively. Please advise about the small discrepancy.
2. Over the years various conflicting uses on the property have been observed or emerged. Below their I am documenting what CDFW has in our file based on Annual Reports and other accounts. The areas with question marks require input by DPW.
3. In regards to the amount of additional willow riparian habitat created since the implementation of the riparian enhancement areas I cannot parse out the details because of the inclusion of the Tujunga ponds. The closest accounting I have observed is in the 2009 annual report that documented what was on the Tujunga Ponds and

BTMA. I am sending that under a separate email. It seems to have way more acreage than the original 207 documented by the Resource Agencies. Please separate out the overlapping or redundant accounting of habitats and provide what is present on the area protected by the CE.

4. Please provide DPW's most recent ledger.