

Colorado Lagoon

Pete Bagoye

to:

eric.lopez

07/19/2010 09:43 AM

Show Details

I feel that the open canal plan to increase flow in Colorado Lagoon is the best solution. I am a member of Friends of the Lagoon and a resident of the Height and support the open canal plan 100%. Thanks.

Pete Bagoye

Shasta Sales

Open chanel at Colorado Lagoon

Zsmrtfred

to:

Friends

07/18/2010 03:08 PM

Cc:

eric.lopez

Show Details

I think that an open channel should be used to help the circulation at the Colorado Lagoon. It should be set up in such a manner that even city kids could have a stream to play in. It is such a shame that so many kids in the city have never had that kind of fun. It also gives them a chance to show a little responsibility. Have you ever seen the stream that goes through the park in Lone Pine, CA. It is really nice.

Common, give our kids a break.

Fred

Colorado lagoon

EKilger

to:

Eric.Lopez, district3

08/03/2010 08:51 AM

Show Details

Hello!

Although not a resident of LB, I did grow up in Belmont Heights and drive down Colorado Avenue regularly. I am also a supporter of FOCL.

For over fifty years I've been aware of this beautiful beach and waterhole that could and would be enjoyed by the neighborhood if it were useable. FOCL has made incredible strides towards this possibility in the last few years and we can't squelch this progress. We must support Alternative 4A.

I urge the city of LB to support FOCL and its very dedicated and knowledgeable leadership. We are closer to a useable and clean lagoon because of them.

Please vote for Alternative 4A so this can happen.

Thank you,

Eve Kilger

Seal Beach

Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project - Alternative 2

Jon VanderMaar1

to:

Eric.lopez

08/03/2010 11:41 AM

Show Details

cid:image001.jpg@01CB3300.A0958080" lang=EN-US link=blue vlink=purple style='margin-left:5.2pt;margin-top:13.05pt'>

Mr. Eric Lopez,

This letter is in regards to the meeting notice for the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project – Phase 2.

Thank you for all the time and information included in your online study. After reading the 4 different alternatives and looking at the water and traffic flow upon completion of this project I would highly recommend the alternative 2 with the open channel and 2 bridges.

This plan takes into consideration the need for park sport activities of baseball as well as the youth and adult soccer fields. It leaves a considerable amount of open space just east of the sport activities for many other park families' wishes and openness for natural beauty.

In my opinion it also restores to the best of nature's ability the natural water flow to and from the Colorado Lagoon.

With Alternative 2 the intersection at Colorado and Elliot would have better visibility by making it a true "T" intersection and not the current "Y" shape. We walk here often and in many cases the people approaching this current intersection up Colorado from the east heading west have a problem with the visibility around the trees and I believe some may also be directionally challenged because they can't see the street signs and think Colorado changes directions. Some drivers don't see that there is a crosswalk with pedestrians and that is another challenge that I think would be corrected by a true "T" intersection.

I'm not sure I will be in town on August 11th but if I am I would be delighted to attend this meeting in Recreation Park.

Thanks again for all your attention to detail on this project,

Jon VanderMaarl

370 N. Trimble Ct

Long Beach, CA 90814

alternative 4a
caleb mileham

to:

Eric.Lopez

08/04/2010 12:08 PM

Show Details

hello eric, i am a resident of southern california and a volunteer naturalist for a non profit organization called Naturalist For You. i recently heard about the work to be done in the colorado lagoon in Long Beach, and i feel it is important that alternative 4a is the most sensible route to be taken to ensure the best outcome for humans, and animals alike.

thank you for reading this, caleb

mileham

Colorado Lagoon Alt 4
Pat Benoit
to:
eric.lopez
08/03/2010 05:44 PM
Show Details

Mr. Lopez,
I am writing to say that I live up the hill from the Lagoon 4433 East Barker Way and am in full support of Alt.4
full flush of the lagoon.

Benoit Consulting Services
Patricia Benoit
562-438-3183H
562-230-8033C

culvert
William Marmion
to:
eric.lopez
08/08/2010 02:39 PM
Please respond to wandcmarm
Show Details

Mr. Lopez. Please add our comments to your collection as we cannot attend the Wed. night meeting at the Burin Den. We are very much in favor of 4a as that seems like the best for the money and the continued health of the lagoon. Thank you. Claire and Bill Marmion 371 Manila Ave. Long Beach 90814 562-597-4030

William Marmion
wandcmarm@earthlink.net
EarthLink Revolves Around You.

Colorado Lagoon Project

William Stringer

to:

District3

08/09/2010 02:02 PM

Cc:

eric.lopez

Please respond to wwstringer

Show Details

Dear Mr DeLong: Please support Alternative 4a as it is the way to do this project right, and decrease long term maintenance. Thank you! Bill and Laura Stringer

Colorado Lagoon Alternative 4a

Jeffrey K Seitelman, MD, PhD

to:

District3

08/10/2010 09:31 PM

Cc:

Eric.Lopez

Show Details

Dear Councilman DeLong:

I am writing to urge a strong favorable response and vote for Alternative 4a. This Alternative is the only one that has the best chance for securing funding and meets all requirements: re-establishing a safe swimming environment, restoration of healthy wildlife ecosystem, and overall environmental restoration. It will also carry the least expensive maintenance costs. Alt. 4a restores full tidal circulation and wetlands habitat. It will also produce a picturesque creek through the park. Once again, I urge a yes vote for 4a. Thank you very much

Jeff Seitelman

Jeffrey K Seitelman, MD, Ph.D., FIPA, DFAPA

345 Saint Joseph Ave

Long Beach 90814

562 799 1417

jeffseitelman@verizon.net

f: 562 799 1418

Open Channel at Marina Vista Park

Larry Denyer

to:

eric.lopez

08/11/2010 11:46 AM

Show Details

Hello Eric,

I will be unable to attend tonight's meeting but I wanted to let you know that my wife and I both disapprove of the open channel through Marina Vista park. For safety purposes, the open channel isn't prudent. Also, after the recent land-swap between Long Beach and Signal Hill (where the Big League Dreams baseball facility was supposed to built), park space for our families is at a premium. Taking away this park space would be a travesty.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen & Larry Denyer

7920 Berner Street

Long Beach, CA 90808

562.431.1308

Colorado Lagoon

Brooke Knowles

to:

Eric.Lopez

08/11/2010 11:44 AM

Show Details

Dear Mr. Lopez:

I have reviewed the alternatives to restore tidal circulation to the Colorado Lagoon and want to share my opinion.

First, a good friend of mine has been working on the project. He was one of the brave souls who went inside the culvert to clean it. I didn't need to hear his stories, all I needed to do was drive by and smell the foul odor. It was a toxic site; I fear for his health. With that fact in mind AND the fact that Alternative 4a has the support of funding agencies and FOCL why would anyone choose Alternatives 1-4? Any and all culverts must be permanently eliminated. The City of Long Beach has the opportunity to do the RIGHT thing. I will be watching the outcome closely.

Sincerely,

Brooke Knowles

266 Saint Joseph Avenue

Long Beach 90803

Poole, James M

to:

Eric.Lopez@longbeach.gov

08/11/2010 09:55 AM

Show Details

Eric

There is a limited amount of (grass) park area for residents of Belmont Shore. Why eliminate sections of Marina Vista park without replacing the grass park areas? An effort should be initiated to create NEW additional grass park areas for residents in Belmont Shore.

Use funding to sink the breakwater (created by the Fed Gov) and clean the harbor.

Thanks

Jim Poole
394 Havana Ave.
Long Beach, CA
90814

Eric Lopez
Property Services Bureau
333 W. Ocean Blvd., 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Mr. Lopez,

I am writing to comment on the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project and the recent Alternatives Analysis Report Phase 2 Study in preparation for the community meeting on August 11, 2010. Though I am not able to attend that meeting in person, I wanted to make clear my views on this project. I hope these comments are passed on in the meeting and to the Marine Commission.

The original scope of the Colorado Lagoon project was to improve the water quality of the Lagoon by increasing tidal flow through Marine Stadium and the Bay. From the Analysis prepared by Moffatt & Nichol: "The purpose of the Phase 2 study is to identify and analyze various alternatives to improve the tidal connection." This is important to consider when some of the analysis of the report goes beyond that scope. For example, one analysis is on Cost per Habitat Acre(CHA), which includes wildlife habitat as a critical factor related to cost of the project. Given the purpose of this project is to improve tidal flow, not to create wildlife habitat, analysis of CHA or any other analysis relating to habitat is extraneous to this project's purpose. Given this, I believe that consideration of the CHA analysis should not be included in any assessment of comparative benefit from the listed Alternatives.

Overall analysis summary (from Table 13-5) of the each alternative accomplishes the goal of improved tidal flow, and therefore improved water quality, at essentially equivalent levels. Each alternative is rated as Excellent in improving tidal flow.

Across other aspects rated, each alternative provides nearly equivalent average 'value' for the areas considered. These include increased wildlife habitat, use of the park for recreation and costs. Across all these areas, each alternative is nearly equivalent overall, though differentially effective in disparate areas. For example, Alternative 4 is rated Excellent in adding wetland habitat, though the other Alternatives are rated less than Excellent. Similarly, Alternative 1 is rated Excellent in accommodating safe recreation at Marina Vista Park, while retaining existing functionality of active sports uses, though the other alternatives are rated less than Excellent. Overall, it appears that the largest distinction between the alternatives is in the comparative value of creating wildlife habitat and preserving the functional use of the park for the community. Though some aspects of park recreation use might be retained should any variation of an open channel be adopted, many would be lost and cannot be mitigated.

One additional aspect, construction impact, should be considered. Recent independent physical engineering analysis (see attached) demonstrates that the short term impact, particularly, though not limited to, construction effects, is much lower for Alternative 1 than for the other Alternatives. This, in conjunction with the benefit of accomplishing the previously addressed goal of improved water, clearly makes Alternative 1 a better choice for the community

The conclusion that Cost and Funding Sources be the likely basis for decision among the alternatives presupposes that currently identified funding sources are the only possible considerations. If funding is the overriding reason for constructing an open channel, would it not beg the question whether having readily available funding for filling in the Lagoon would make that something to pursue? Moreover, the report fails to fully analyze the actual maintenance costs. Detailed costs of construction are provided (Table 3-13), but no such analysis of maintenance costs is provided. It would appear that the long-term costs of Alternative 4 (especially with regard to bridge maintenance) are underestimated in the Moffatt & Nichol report. Moffatt & Nichol also seem to ignore the maintenance cost for the sewage lift station that would be required for Alternative 4. Their analysis (section 3.6.5) indicates the parallel culvert maintenance as being more than twice that of Alternative_5. This _defies common sense. However, full assessment does not appear possible at this time. A detailed analysis should be prepared.

Finally, the community impact is a critical aspect to consider, and preserving the functional and actual use of Marina Vista Park with regard to recreation, sporting, and community value is of highest importance in arriving at a final decision. I strongly urge adoption of Alternative 1 for this project. Thank you for considering my view. I am happy to provide further information or be available if further discussion or questions need be addressed.

Sincerely,

Mark H. Michaels, Ph.D.

Lagoon Meeting tonight

Matt Kirk

to:

Eric Lopez

08/11/2010 09:07 AM

Cc:

craig, "TERESA KELLEY", "Dave Holguin"

Show Details

Eric,

I will be out of town tonight and not able to attend the meeting tonight. I have asked others to attend to make sure we are heard as NOT being for the Open. Channel.

I have attached an analysis of the Impacts and Mitigation Measures outlined in the EIR that I would appreciate you distributing to the Marine Commission and making available to whomever may want to review. Whoever gets the analysis may want a copy of the EIR section that it refers to, let me know and I will be able to provide a .pdf of the referenced sections.

Thanks for your help.

Matthew Kirk, P.E.

MK Engineering Group

3621 S. Harbor Blvd. Ste. 100

Santa Ana, CA 92704

Main (657) 622-2100

Direct (714) 460-7259

Analysis of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – Open Channel vs. Parallel Culvert

This report will provide a side by side comparison of the open channel vs. the parallel culvert option as described in the EIR as Alternative 3 "Recreation Alternative". It will identify specific components of Phase I and II that can be modified or eliminated and still meet all project objectives. According to the EIR "the parallel culvert would be the same size as the existing culvert". The parallel culvert as described achieves over 90% of the tidal flush values of the open channel option. In conversations with the City an assertion was made that a parallel culvert could match the OC in flow volume. The City asked M&N to comment on the assertion, per an email, dated 9/09/08 (attached), Moffat and Nichol agrees that a parallel culvert can match the flow of the open channel, "I don't disagree with him that we could achieve the same tidal flushing with a second parallel culvert".

In the analysis below OC is used as an abbreviation for the open channel and PC is used for the parallel culvert.

Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

There are fundamental differences between the OC and PC options that will percolate through most if not all of the mitigation measures. The discussion below will identify three fundamental differences and discuss the impact those differences have on the mitigation measures. The discussion will show what mitigation measures are at a minimum the same (impact), what reduce the required mitigation measure (impact) or completely eliminate the need for mitigation. The analysis will clearly show that construction of the PC alternative has substantially less impact on the surrounding community than the OC.

A comparison of the parallel culvert and open channel yield the following conditions that will have an impact on all mitigation measures in terms of **duration of construction**, **total disturbed area**, and impact on **water quality** as a result of the means and methods of construction required for the two options.

Duration of Construction – Duration of construction of the open channel is not stated in Section 3.0. Based on the description of the construction process and assuming no delays in construction the open could be constructed in 8 – 12 weeks. The bridge construction, according to Section 3.5.1, will take 6 months each for a total of 12 months. Total construction time for the open channel 14-15 months minimum. The most probable duration would be 18 months (based on professional opinion).

The parallel culvert construction duration using precast concrete box sections could be completed within 8 weeks, of initial excavation, including inlet and outlet structures. The portions across the roadways could be installed within a week each. A cast in place box culvert could be completed within 16 weeks. These time frames have been discussed with two contractors and deemed reasonable based on the description of the project.

The most likely delays that could happen from a construction stand point are: adverse soil conditions, and delays due to weather and a delay do to presence of a sea turtle or marine mammal within 500m as prescribed in mitigation measure BIO-10. The adverse soil condition would cause a delay in either alternative. The PC removes much less soil than the OC and thus would be less liable to encounter adverse (or possible toxic) soil conditions. The same is true for weather, a shorter duration project is at less risk of being delayed than a longer duration project.

The PC can be constructed in a much shorter time frame and is less likely to be affected by unknown conditions and adverse weather. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that any mitigation measure could be shortened by at least 10 months with the PC construction as opposed to the OC construction

Total disturbed area - Open channel and softball field construction requires construction activities in the area bound by the walking trail on the west to the back of sidewalk along Eliot Street on the southerly and easterly sides and to the back of sidewalk of Colorado Street on the north, approximately 6ac. Parallel culvert construction could be done within a 150' wide strip of land adjacent to the existing culvert alignment, approximately 3ac. With a total disturbed area approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ of the OC construction machinery will spend less time working the disturbed area. Dust control, clearing operations, tree removal, and construction traffic, will be greatly reduced for a smaller area. Approximately 20 trees will not be removed with the PC construction an analysis of the carbon footprint comparison would be a interesting exercise for a project $\frac{1}{2}$ area and $\frac{1}{4}$ the duration.

It is counter intuitive to suggest a total disturbed area of 6 ac for up to 16 months would have less impact than 3ac for 4 months. The reduction in trees being removed alone is sufficient to determine the PC is a significantly less disruptive project than the OC.

Water Quality During Construction – Section 3.5.1 indicates the “existing culvert will be demolished as part of the open channel construction” and that “The culvert will be opened once every two weeks during construction” “for 2 to 3 days”. During this time the construction “may lead to stagnation and water quality problems”. The mitigation measure for this is to install “two subsurface aeration systems”. The construction of the OC will have a detrimental impact on water quality of the lagoon during construction, a clear contradiction to two Project Objective stated in Section 3.4 of the EIR one to “Improve water quality by increasing the Lagoon’s circulation” and the other to “Enhance public enjoyment of the Lagoon”. The Lagoon will be closed to swimming during most of the construction duration. It also discusses that if construction is performed during the wet months the construction would need to be delayed to allow storm flows through the channel thus further delaying completion of the OC. These may be unavoidable impacts in construction of the OC but they are non-existent impacts with the PC.

PC construction can be completed with no impact to existing circulation (or improved circulation of the cleaned culvert). PC construction does not require the demolition of the

existing lifeline that is the existing culvert, for the lagoon. Inlet structures can be built behind coffer dams at each end of the culvert and sealed to prevent water from moving beyond the headwalls until the connection is completed. During construction of the PC the existing culvert (cleaned or not) can maintain the lifeline the lagoon has today, no decrease in water quality for this alternative. No Project Objectives are compromised by this alternative.

The PC construction has a net no impact on water quality and the OC construction has a net negative impact on water quality.

Many of the mitigation measures discuss a grading permit being required for the OC, a grading permit is not necessarily required for the PC. For this discussion it will be assumed a grading permit will be obtained for the PC.

The following comments are to the issues documented in Table 7.A of the EIR. This table is attached for reference and comparison.

AES -1: Parallel culvert (PC) construction has a smaller total disturbed area and removes 20???? fewer trees. The screening requirements would only apply to a smaller area and for a shorter duration. The PC impact is substantially less than the OC.

AES-2 Relocation of restrooms not required for PC. Mitigation measure not required for OC.

AQ-1 See **Short-Term Construction-Related Noise Impacts** above. The PC requires approximately 1/5th the soil removal as the OC. At 1/5th of the export required for the OC the PC impact is substantially less than the OC.

AQ-2 The PC would have the same requirements but for a significantly shorter time frame. The PC impact is substantially less than the OC.

AQ-3 Same as AQ-2.

AQ-4 Same as AQ-2.

AQ-5 Same as AQ-2.

AQ-6 Same as AQ-2.

AQ-7 Same as AQ-2. The majority of the PC construction is beyond the 250' limit.

AQ-8 Same as AQ-2. The PC would require a much smaller volume of "dredged" material than the OC.

- BIO-1 Same impact, reduced area of impact for PC may increase chance of not disturbing specimen.
- BIO-2 Fewer trees are removed for PC and minor modifications to phase I could avoid (minimize) removal of palms. PC impacts are significantly less than the OC.
- BIO-3 Same
- BIO-4 Same
- BIO-5 Same
- BIO-6 The PC construction can be completed within 135 and eelgrass mitigation could be completed as prescribed. OC construction will exceed 135 days may require additional eelgrass mitigation.
- BIO-7 Same
- BIO-8 The reduced time frame for PC construction minimizes the exposure of construction stoppage as a result of the presence of the listed marine animals.
- BIO-9 Same as BIO-8.
- BIO-10 Same as BIO-8.
- BIO-11 Same as BIO-8.
- BIO-12 The reduced construction time and disturbed area for the PC greatly reduces the possible impacts for this measure. The PC is at much less risk of being delayed.
- BIO-13 Slight modifications to the project can greatly reduce the number of trees being mitigated thus reducing the possibility of the new trees not meeting the prescribed guidelines. The PC avoids the removal of at least 20??? trees. The PC impact is significantly less than the OC.
- CULT-1 The majority of the area to be disturbed is artificial fill the likely hood of the discovery of archaeological materials is minimal. The PC has a much smaller disturbed area therefore the chances are reduced further.
- CULT-2 Same as CULT-1.
- CULT-3 Same as CULT-1.
- GEO-1 The PC will not required slope protection measures as required for the OC. Erosion will only be an issue for the banks of the open channel and around the

bridge piers and footings. The geological issues are significantly less for the PC than for the OC.

GEO-2 Same

HAZ-1 The PC has significantly less soil removal required therefore the chance for encounter is significantly reduced. The PC impact is significantly less than the OC.

HAZ-2 Same

HAZ-3 The PC has significantly less construction duration and soil removal therefore the exposure or encounter with toxic substances is minimized. The PC impact is significantly less than the OC.

HAZ-4 Same as HAZ-3.

WQ-1 The PC has reduced construction duration and total disturbed area than the OC. Construction of the OC will require more reporting requirements to the State Regional Board for the longer construction time (1 year+). The PC impact on water quality is significantly less than the OC.

WQ-2 Same as WQ-1.

WQ-3 Same.

WQ-4 Not required for PC construction. The existing culvert can remain open during the PC construction. Water quality of the lagoon will **not** be negatively impacted by PC construction.

WQ-5 The shorter duration of PC construction possible dewatering necessity is minimized. Note: The determination of "discharge to the storm drain system or surface waters" seems mute, since all storm drains drain directly to surface waters. A more practical mitigation measure would be to require all water from dewatering operations discharge to the closest surface water via a three cell (tank) separator system.

WQ-6 Same

WQ-7 The reduced amount of soil removal for the PC minimizes this impact.

WQ-8 Same as WQ-7.

WQ-9 Same as WQ-4. If water quality is unsafe for recreational use it will not likely be as a result of construction related activities of the PC.

NOI-1 The PC can be constructed without the use of pile driving activities. Pile driving activities can be completely eliminated with minor changes to phase I

components. Pile driving activities are listed as the "noisiest activity on site" in Section 4.9.5 **Short-Term Construction-Related Noise Impacts**. The reduced time of construction and reduced disturbed area and minimal noise generation makes the PC an overwhelmingly superior alternative to the OC. The PC has significantly less impact than the OC.

NOI-2 The reduced time of construction and reduced disturbed area and minimal noise generation makes the PC an overwhelmingly superior alternative to the OC. The PC has significantly less impact than the OC.

NOI-3 Same as NOI-2.

NOI-4 Same as NOI-2.

NOI-5 Same as NOI-1.

NOI-6 Same as NOI-2.

PSU-1 Not required. The PC will maintain the existing surface features save the two new inlet/outlet structures of the PC.

PSU-2 Same. Note: Using reclaimed water on a water quality improvement project seems counterproductive.

PSU-3 The PC can be constructed with precast concrete sections with minimal formwork required at the inlet/outlet structures. Precasting will be done offsite thus minimizing any sacrificial material use. The PC has significantly less impact than the OC.

REC-1 The reduced time of construction and reduced disturbed area and minimal water quality impacts will minimize Lagoon closures compared to the OC. The PC significantly reduces the impact as compared to the OC.

REC-2 The reduced time of construction and reduced disturbed area minimizes the impact to Marina Vista Park and thus all groups, leagues and local residents. Note: "other nearby available City parks" are not nearby and not available during the peak use time. The next closest City park with similar amenities is more than two miles away (Whaley Park). The EIR only analyzed the "permitted use" of the park not the actual use of the park. Some of the activities may be temporarily relocated during construction while many will be permanently gone after the park is divided by the OC. The PC has significantly less impact on Marina Vista Park than the OC.

TR-1 The PC can be constructed across Colorado Street and Eliot Street in a matter of weeks as opposed to six months each for bridge construction at each street. The reduced duration of construction and reduced soil removal minimizes any traffic disruption as a result of construction. The PC significantly reduces the impact as compared to the OC.

The above analysis clearly shows that for every mitigation measure the impact, of the PC, is either equal to the impact, of the OC, or significantly reduced and in some cases nonexistent. The reduced impact of the PC is most dramatic in many of the most offensive impacts. Any impact related to noise, length of impact, water quality, air quality, traffic, and disruption to the community is reduced with the PC alternative.

Section 4.9.5

Short-Term Construction-Related Vibration Impacts.

Section 4.9.5 states "The closest pile driving activities to a sensitive receptor would occur at a distance of 112 ft from the residential uses located near the intersection of East Colorado Street and Orlena Avenue." According to Figure 4.9.1 the nearest pile driving activities appear to be much less than the 112 ft as described in the EIR. It appears the distance would be approximately half that stated in the EIR. The use of "Equation 9 and Table 17 from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) *Transportation and Construction- Induced Vibration Guidance Manual* (Jones & Stokes, June 2004)" should be reapplied using a distance of 50 ft as opposed to the 112 ft discussed. Will the threshold of 0.1 in/sec (for architectural damage) be exceeded with the shorter distance? If so, the statement of "the proposed project would not result in any significant vibration impacts" would be erroneous.

This would not be an issue with culvert construction. Pile driving will not be required.

Short-Term Construction-Related Noise Impacts.

Not removing the North parking area and restrooms would minimize this impact.

Per section 3.5.1 Phase II excavation for the open channel construction is "approximately 25,500 cy "*. The typical truck for this type of excavation carries approximately 10 cy that is approximately 2550 truck trips. The volume of displaced soil for a parallel culvert is approximately 4200 cy (based on a 9'x14' outside dimension box culvert) or approximately 420 truck trips to export the material required for the parallel culvert. The parallel culvert export, truck trips and thus noise impact is 20% less than that of the open channel.

* based on a 100' wide channel 14' deep by 1000' long it could be as high as 30,000 cy or 2580 more truck trips than the culvert construction.

The open channel requires the relocation of the existing softball field and will require grading operations from the open channel north to Eliot Street. The parallel culvert construction zone could be done within a 150' zone of the existing culvert. Total disturbed area would be 1/3 to 1/2 that required for the open channel and softball field

reconstruction. The remaining area of the park, during culvert construction, would be available for community use.

Demolition of existing restrooms will not be required with PC.

Bridges will not be required with PC.

If the viewing platform is eliminated or redesigned to be floating, pile driving equipment will be minimized if not completely eliminated from the project. "Pile driving will be the noisiest activity on site" minimizing this activity will have achieved the greatest reduction in construction impact.

On-site Preschool

The dredging operations are unavoidable in the restoration effort because removal of the toxic silt is imperative to the restoration effort. However Colorado Street bridge construction will occur within 315' of the preschool and will have duration of approximately six months, according to Section 3.5.1. Section 4.9.5 states "The preschool shall be closed whenever construction or pile driving would occur within 315 and 706 feet, respectively". Given those two statements from the EIR the preschool/model boat shop **will be closed** the entire six month duration plus whatever duration is required for the dredging.

The entire parallel culvert construction could be completed in less than two months. The duration of construction within the 315' preschool/model boat shop zone is dramatically reduced with the parallel culvert. Pile driving will not be required for the parallel culvert construction.

Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project -- Phase 2

Ragland, Robert

to:

'Eric.Lopez@longbeach.gov'

08/10/2010 04:27 PM

Show Details

Hi Eric, my wife and I will be on vacation during the August 11 meeting and were unable to attend the previous two meetings because they were scheduled during work hours. We have lived on Orlena Ave. for 16 years and see the lagoon and Marina Vista Park everyday. I've read the EIR and its update with the recommendations. I think the EIR and the update really discount both the amount and types of active usage that the park gets on a daily basis.

During the last five years or so the use of Marina Vista Park as for active sports and recreation has increased dramatically. During the last months the open field space has been taken up with adult rugby practices and games, lacrosse practices, LB pop warner football practices, a regular cricket game that lasts all day on both Saturday and Sunday, and grass volleyball tournaments. These activities are separate from the youth soccer, baseball, and flag football practices that occur there during the school year. The open field space is crowded now and is only getting more crowded.

Obviously, the lagoon restoration project creates a land use tension between those that favor the open field space, and those in favor of creating a open channel that connects to Marine Stadium. The open channel proponents' argument that the channel will not reduce existing ball fields is, I think, misreading the actual active use of the park. There are no youth leagues that I am aware of, beside LB Rec. flag football, that actually play their league games at MVP. The utility of the park is that the teams can practice there because there is open field space, and parents do not have to drive their kids away from their neighborhoods to practice. It is more a place for spontaneous play and youth practices, then for organized league play. There really is no other place like it in Belmont Shore, Belmont Heights, Naples and Alamitos Heights. The closest place is Whaley Park, which is across both 7th Street and PCH.

My question is, has the city given any thought to regrading and removing some trees from the eastern portion of the park (on the other side of the playground) to create more open recreational field space? I think a commitment by the city to do that would go along way to mediating a resolution that most all of the residents would be happy with.

Does the Parks and Recreation Department make a recommendation to the City Council regarding Phase 2 of this Project? If so, when is that recommendation expected to occur?

Also, has the city given any thought to actually marking out the areas of the different open channel proposals, so those interested could get a visual idea of the actual proportions of the different open channel options?

Would the recreation department have interest in surveying the current and future active recreational use of the fields, such that should an open channel project become a reality, to determine how best to design open field space? (For example, the overlay the soccer field in the outfield of the softball diamond in reality only one of those activities can occur at one time.)

Let me know what you find out. Thanks.

Robert Ragland
Principal Deputy County Counsel
(213) 974-1928
rragland@counsel.lacounty.gov

Notice of Confidential Communication: This email message, including any attachments, from the Office of the County Counsel is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, attorney work-product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.



Colorado Lagoon Improvement

Gordana Kajer to: eric.lopez

Cc: Gary DeLong

08/12/2010 08:07 AM

Good morning, Eric.

The meeting last night at the Bruin Den on the Colorado Lagoon improvement was really well done. I believe the Parks, Rec and Marine Commission listened to your presentation in the spirit of planning the very best possible restoration to the lagoon to benefit the community. The commission had the opportunity to hear from the public about concerns and a long-term vision for the lagoon. I am writing to add my support to Alternative 4a, endorsed by FOCL, and which gives the greatest ability for wetlands restoration and natural tidal flow to the Colorado Lagoon.

Thank you!

Gordana Kajer

235 Loma Avenue

Long Beach CA 90803

Ph: 562-438-9161

Lagoon Alternative 4a choice

Judy Seitelman

to:

eric.lopez

08/12/2010 11:10 PM

Show Details

Dear Mr. Lopez,

Please tell City administrators that Alternative 4a is the only alternative that meets all requirements for the Colorado Lagoon restoration and that my family supports that choice.

We have long supported the cleaning up of the lagoon, and we would like the City to make the best possible choice for the longtime health of our neighborhood and the environment.

Thank you, 3rd district resident Judy Seitelman



Colorado Lagoon
meyer to: Eric.Lopez

08/12/2010 04:38 PM

It is vital to support option 4a to restore our Colorado Lagoon to the clean water days of the 40's and 50's. Thank you, Jon and Sylvia Meyer

Lagoon Phase 2 Comment Against
Craig Wallace
to:
eric.lopez
08/12/2010 01:46 PM
Show Details

Eric,

Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the meeting last night.
I find it sad that the city is so willing to sell out open usable space for something unusable,
when the same end goal of clean water can be achieved with the underground culvert.

FOCL is reaching for an opportunity.

The city should at least survey the proposed channel, and stake it out and leave the stakes up
for public comment. There are many people that still have no idea what is going on.

Has anyone considered what impact an open channel will have on the Thursday Night
Summer Concerts?

Since the city is so hooked on FOCL's KOOL-AIDE, they should at least upgrade the entire
park, and not just rehab/move the softball area.

The renderings are not what it will look like in the end, but most people can not understand
that.

Craig Wallace

Wallace Real Estate Services
Residential & Commercial Appraisals



wallace real estate services
Appraisals

"Covering Southern California's Real Estate Needs"
www.WallaceRES.com
p 562.673.1138
f 562.494.6577

Colorado Lagoon Yes on 4a

jujube712@juno.com

to:

Eric.Lopez

08/14/2010 12:50 PM

Show Details

We feel very strongly that the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project Alternative 4a is the best choice for Long Beach residents. It meets all requirements, has the best chance of securing funding, and requires the least maintenance in the long term resulting in the lowest cost to the city. Sincerely, Charles Courdy and Elaine Burdell

Colorado Lagoon

Frank Fata

to:

gary

08/14/2010 01:59 PM

Cc:

Eric.Lopez

Show Details

Dear Councilman DeLong:

My wife (Kristin Brown) and I have considered the issues and we strongly support alternative 4a for the Colorado Lagoon. Let's do it right!

Yours truly,

Frank Fata

7 Seventieth Place



Alternatives for Colorado Lagoon
Pat Bliss to: Eric Lopez

08/15/2010 12:27 PM

Eric Lopez
Department of Community Development
City of Long Beach

Dear Mr. Lopez:

I'm writing in support of Alternative 4a for the restoration of Colorado Lagoon.

My reasons for preferring this alternative, follow in order of importance to me:

1. It will provide the most wetlands environment, including more habitat for wetlands creatures and better recreational walks for people.
2. The construction is most likely to be funded with mitigation money.
3. It will cost the city less for maintenance.

I hope Alternative 4a will be recommended as number one choice by the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Patricia T. Bliss
7215 E. Killdee Street
Long Beach, CA 90808



alternative 4a, Colorado Lagoon restoration
Michael & Carol Letteriello to: Eric.Lopez

08/15/2010 09:13 PM

Hello - Let me add my voice to those who support Alternative 4a in the restoration of the Colorado Lagoon.

Thank you.

Mike Letteriello
Long Beach CA



Colorado Lagoon
Ellen Butler to: Eric.Lopez

08/16/2010 12:46 PM

Dear Eric:

First of all, a thank you for how well you ran the meeting recently at Rec Park and how well you handled some of the people asking questions/making statements. That you were constantly unruffled and professional, knowledgeable and helpful was noted and appreciated. But that is an aside to the main reason I am writing.

I am a local home owner living not far from the Colorado Lagoon and Marine Stadium. As a home owner interested in the value of my property, as a runner interested in traffic-free or traffic-negligible places to run, and as an environmentalist very concerned with wetlands and water quality, I am extremely concerned about which option is chosen for the final stage of the Colorado Lagoon restoration.

How many emails have you received detailing the reasons why Alternative 4a is the clearly superior alternative? Surely many, so I am not going to make this longer by running the list.

An open channel is the only sensible choice. And 4a is the best of the open channel choices.

Please . . . for now . . . and for generations to come, do the right thing and support Alternative 4a.

Ellen Butler
4450 E. 6th St.
Long Beach 90814
562.434.5197
eebutler@charter.net



Fw: colorado lagoon
Council District3 to: Eric Lopez
Sent by: Joseph Toney

08/16/2010 03:04 PM

Kate Echlin please vote for alternative 4a in regard to the col...

08/03/2010 09:13:55 AM



colorado lagoon

Kate Echlin to district3

08/03/2010 09:13 AM

please vote for alternative 4a in regard to the colorado lagoon restoration by august 31st.

thank you,

kate echlin
3rd district resident

Colorado Lagoon needs your help again!

This is a do-or-die time for the Colorado Lagoon restoration! The city will be making a crucial decision on how to restore full tidal circulation to the lagoon in the next few weeks. If they get it right, problems that began 50 years ago will be reversed and the lagoon will once again be a safe location for recreational swimming, a healthy home for wildlife, and a world-class example of a grassroots environmental restoration. If they get it wrong, the lagoon will remain a second-class water body that locals avoid, is closed regularly due to unhealthy conditions, and casts shame on the city of Long Beach.

The City Council commissioned a study to analyze alternatives to restore essential tidal circulation at Colorado Lagoon. In the next few weeks the city will be deciding which alternative to pursue. FOCL has extensively reviewed this study, and it is our conclusion that **Alternative 4a is the only alternative that meets all requirements and has the best chance for securing funding.**

Funding agencies have expressed strong support for Alternative 4a because it restores full and permanent tidal circulation and lost wetlands habitat. This alternative provides the most diverse recreational opportunities, maintains and enhances all existing playing fields, and creates a beautiful tidal creek through the park. It is very important to note that Alternative 4a requires the least maintenance in the long term resulting in the lowest cost to the city.



Fw: Support Alternative 4a for Colorado Lagoon Restoration
Council District3 to: Eric Lopez
Sent by: Joseph Toney

08/16/2010 03:04 PM

Dianne Alley

Dear City Council Member, Gary Delong, I woul...

08/10/2010 11:08:53 AM



Support Alternative 4a for Colorado Lagoon Restoration

Dianne Alley to: District3

08/10/2010 11:08 AM

Dear City Council Member, Gary Delong,

I would like to express my support for Alternative 4a for the Colorado Lagoon restoration. It is the only alternative that meets all requirements and has the best chance for securing funding. It will also require the least maintenance in the long term - an important consideration when looking at long term costs to the city.

Thank You,

Dianne Alley
238 Argonne Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90803



Fw: Concerts in the Park and Colorado Lagoon Restoration
Council District3 to: Eric Lopez
Sent by: Joseph Toney

08/16/2010 03:03 PM

"Jeannine Saucedo"

Dear Councilman DeLong,

08/06/2010 06:12:43 PM



Concerts in the Park and Colorado Lagoon Restoration

Jeannine Saucedo to: District3

08/06/2010 06:12 PM

Cc
: "Mike Saucedo"

Dear Councilman DeLong,

I apologies in advance for my long e-mail, I am writing today to express my concern and thoughts over two very important issues coming up for discussion. My family and I will be on vacation and I will not be able to attend the upcoming City Council Meeting or the Community Meeting regarding the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project. I know you are a busy man; however these issues are too important to me, my family and community not to express my concern. We have met a few times, the last being at The Duree's "Meet and Greet" before the election. I understand you to be a politician who will listen and vote according to the wishes of the majority of your constituents; therefore I am taking the time to write to you today.

I understand at the upcoming City Council Meeting you will discuss budget cuts that include cutting community events like Concert in the Park, Christmas Tress on the Bay/Lagoon and our two community Christmas Parades. I am against losing these cherished events.

Lately, my husband and I often talk about what keeps us in Long Beach. Our local school test scores are down (Lowell, Rogers, Wilson) compared to schools in other cities. An innocent teenager was shot and killed at our local High School football game. Burglary is up in our neighborhood of Alamitos Heights; our car was broken into 3 weeks ago in front of our house. Vagrants asking for a hand out as you enter and leave our community on 7th St., P.C.H. and Bellflower. Our local playground at Colorado Lagoon is in disrepair and unsafe for children to play on and Marina Vista Park is not in the best shape and threatened to lose valuable open park space.

Yet we stay here in Long Beach. We stay because of the sense of community events like Concert in the Park, Christmas Tress on the Bay and our Parades bring. It brings value to our community and families. Our Long Beach community stands out and is different than other in Southern

California. I have friends and family that come from all over to enjoy these events with us and when they do we spend more money at our local stores and restaurants. If we lose these community events it maybe the final deciding factor to leave Long Beach. Please do what you can to keep these treasured events and traditions in our community. If need be, my Husband and I would support a small tax to support these events.

In regard to the Community Meeting over the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project and the "Open Channel", I am against losing this valuable open park space and I am greatly concerned over the cost to maintain a channel once it is in place. It is the concusses of the community and myself that the Colorado Lagoon needs to be cleaned up and treated like the treasure it is and shame on the City of Long Beach to wait 60 years before cleaning the culvert that flushes the Lagoon.

The idea of an open channel alarms me since the city has no money and is making budget cuts that affect the quality of our community. How will Long Beach have the money to maintain an open channel? Marina Vista Park is not in the best shape as it is now. How can the city also keep up with the additional maintenance of an open channel water-way? Long Beach can't maintain what it already has and now we are going to add more! In addition the park space in our area of Long Beach is minimal. Taking space away for a channel that will look hideous and not be maintained distresses me. I understand the open channel is the best means to flush the Lagoon, however once it is there how will the city of Long Beach afford to maintain it when it can't manage what it already has. The city of Long Beach helped make the Colorado Lagoon the mess it is today and I am apprehensive and have no faith the city can manage and maintain an additional water-way 2 blocks from my home.

Thank you for taking the time to read my LONG e-mail and consider my concerns and thoughts as a voting citizen of Long Beach. Now I have to go pack my family for our vacation and ship the two gold fish and turtle to my neighbor.

Sincerely,
Jeannine Saucedo
5333 Vermont St.
Long Beach, CA 90814
(562) 498-8616



Fw: Colorado Lagoon
Council District3 to: Eric Lopez
Sent by: Joseph Toney

08/16/2010 03:02 PM

Brooke Knowles

Dear Mr. DeLong, I have reviewed the alternativ...

08/11/2010 11:47:10 AM



Colorado Lagoon

Brooke Knowles to: District3

08/11/2010 11:47 AM

From: Brooke Knowles <wavelength2@gmail.com>

To: District3@LongBeach.gov

Dear Mr. DeLong,

I have reviewed the alternatives to restore tidal circulation to the Colorado Lagoon and want to share my opinion.

First, a good friend of mine has been working on the project. He was one of the brave souls who went inside the culvert to clean it. I didn't need to hear his stories, all I needed to do was drive by and smell the foul odor. It was a toxic site; I fear for his health. With that fact in mind AND the fact that Alternative 4a has the support of funding agencies and FOCL why would anyone choose Alternatives 1-4? Any and all culverts must be permanently eliminated. The Council has the opportunity to do the RIGHT thing. I will be watching the outcome closely.

Sincerely,

Brooke Knowles
266 St. Joseph Avenue



Fw: Colorado Lagoon Alternative 4a
Council District3 to: Eric Lopez
Sent by: Joseph Toney

08/16/2010 03:01 PM

"Jeffrey K Seitelman, MD, PhD"

Dear Councilman DeLong: I am w...

08/10/2010 09:31:20 PM



Colorado Lagoon Alternative 4a

Jeffrey K Seitelman, MD, PhD to: District3

08/10/2010 09:31 PM

Cc
: Eric.Lopez

From: "Jeffrey K Seitelman, MD, PhD" <jeffseitelman@verizon.net>

To: District3@longbeach.gov

Cc: Eric.Lopez@longbeach.gov

Dear Councilman DeLong:

I am writing to urge a strong favorable response and vote for Alternative 4a. This Alternative is the only one that has the best chance for securing funding and meets all requirements: re-establishing a safe swimming environment, restoration of healthy wildlife ecosystem, and overall environmental restoration. It will also carry the least expensive maintenance costs. Alt. 4a restores full tidal circulation and wetlands habitat. It will also produce a picturesque creek through the park. Once again, I urge a yes vote for 4a. Thank you very much

Jeff Seitelman
Jeffrey K Seitelman, MD, Ph.D., FIPA, DFAPA
345 Saint Joseph Ave
Long Beach 90814
562 799 1417
jeffseitelman@verizon.net
f: 562 799 1418



Fw: do the right thing on the colorado lagoon
Council District3 to: Eric Lopez
Sent by: Joseph Toney

08/16/2010 03:01 PM

"Eileen Matos"

Dear Mr. DeLong-

08/10/2010 04:27:58 PM



do the right thing on the colorado lagoon

Eileen Matos to: District3

08/10/2010 04:27 PM

From: "Eileen Matos" <emmatos@earthlink.net>

To: <District3@LongBeach.gov>

Dear Mr. DeLong-

We all know what the right thing to do on the Colorado Lagoon is. Alternative 4a is the only alternative that provides a long-lasting fix to the water issues (eye sore) of the Colo. Lagoon. This is the most prudent option available with the least maintenance and lowest cost to Long Beach (we taxpayers). We hope that you realize that there are many in your district who feel this way, but don't take the time to contact you. I felt this one required you to know that we support the 4a option.

Sincerely,

Eileen Visser
285 Glendora Ave
Long Beach, CA 90803

Dear Councilman DeLong

We live in your district and strongly support Alternative 4a for the Colorado Lagoon restoration. We are hopeful this alternative will be approved, and we can once again have a lagoon useable for swimming as well as restoring a healthy home for wildlife.

Thank You.

Stu and Linda Baron



Fw: Alternative 4a
Council District3 to: Eric Lopez
Sent by: Joseph Toney

08/16/2010 03:01 PM

Office of Councilmember Gary DeLong
3rd District
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6300
(562) 570-6186
www.LongBeach.Gov/District3

----- Forwarded by Joseph Toney/LD/CLB on 08/16/2010 03:00 PM -----



Re: Alternative 4a 

Council District3 to: SiliMili

08/12/2010 05:29 PM

Sent by: Joseph Toney

From: Council District3/LD/CLB

To: SiliMili@aol.com

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Baron,

Thank you for your email regarding the Colorado Lagoon. I will make sure that Councilmember DeLong receives your input. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joseph D. Toney
Office of Councilmember Gary DeLong
3rd District
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6300
(562) 570-6186
www.LongBeach.Gov/District3

SiliMili

Dear Councilman DeLong

08/10/2010 03:09:18 PM



Alternative 4a

SiliMili to District3

08/10/2010 03:09 PM

From: SiliMili@aol.com

To: District3@LongBeach.gov



Fw: Alternative 4a, Colorado Lagoon restoration
Council District3 to: Eric Lopez
Sent by: Joseph Toney

08/16/2010 03:00 PM

Office of Councilmember Gary DeLong
3rd District
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6300
(562) 570-6186

www.LongBeach.Gov/District3

----- Forwarded by Joseph Toney/LD/CLB on 08/16/2010 03:00 PM -----



Re: Alternative 4a, Colorado Lagoon restoration

Council District3 to: Michael & Carol Letteriello

08/16/2010 10:31 AM

Sent by: Joseph Toney

From: Council District3/LD/CLB

To: Michael & Carol Letteriello <letteriello@charter.net>

Dear Mr. Letteriello,

Thank you for your email regarding the Colorado Lagoon. I will make sure that Councilmember DeLong receives your input. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joseph D. Toney
Office of Councilmember Gary DeLong
3rd District
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6300
(562) 570-6186
www.LongBeach.Gov/District3

Michael & Carol Letteriello Hello- I reside in your district. I'd like to...

08/15/2010 09:15:32 PM



Alternative 4a, Colorado Lagoon restoration

Michael & Carol Letteriello to: District3

08/15/2010 09:15 PM

Hello-

I reside in your district. I'd like to add my voice to those who support Alternative 4a in the restoration of the Colorado Lagoon.

Thank you.

Mike Letteriello
Long Beach CA



friends

Honorable Gary DeLong:

My name is Kenneth Sams. I still live at 755 Los Altos Ave in Alamitos Heights. I was born in Long Beach and moved into 755 Los Altos in 1951 when my father and his fireman friends completed the house. I attended Lowell, Rogers and Wilson. I grew up playing in the fields on the north side of the marine stadium before any development was done in that area.

I have watched this part of town over-develop over the years and witnessed the west end of the marine stadium get filled in which increased the length of the tidal connection from the marine stadium to the lagoon from just 50ft under Colorado Ave through a pair of tidal gates to what must now be 200 or 300ft of underground culvert. It is no wonder that the tidal cleansing of the lagoon has been compromised.

Those childhood days were a wonderful time as we could walk home from Rogers Jr. High and stop by the old rowing club pier and fish or just watch the rowing shells being launched. Those days are gone of course, but we have a chance to restore the quality of water in the lagoon to make this a place where once again kids growing up in the area can play and swim in a healthful environment as well as improve the esthetics of the over-all area.

I urge you to support the Colorado Lagoon Alternative 4a to restore essential tidal circulation of the Colorado Lagoon.

Sincerely, Kenneth Sams
755 Los Altos Ave
Long Beach, CA 90804
562 498-1876



Fw: Colorado Lagoon
Council District3 to: Eric Lopez
Sent by: Joseph Toney


08/16/2010 03:00 PM

From: Council District3/LD/CLB
To: Eric Lopez/CD/CLB@CLB
Sent by: Joseph Toney/LD/CLB

Office of Councilmember Gary DeLong
3rd District
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6300
(562) 570-6186
www.LongBeach.Gov/District3

----- Forwarded by Joseph Toney/LD/CLB on 08/16/2010 02:59 PM -----



Re: Colorado Lagoon 
Council District3 to: Kenny Sams

08/16/2010 10:32 AM

Sent by: Joseph Toney

From: Council District3/LD/CLB
To: Kenny Sams <ksams4@me.com>

Dear Mr. Sams,

Thank you for your email regarding the Colorado Lagoon. I will make sure that Councilmember DeLong receives your input. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joseph D. Toney
Office of Councilmember Gary DeLong
3rd District
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6300
(562) 570-6186
www.LongBeach.Gov/District3

Kenny Sams Honorable Gary DeLong: My name is Kenneth S...

08/13/2010 10:22:18 PM



Colorado Lagoon
Kenny Sams to: District3

08/13/2010 10:22 PM

Cc

Colorado Lagoon
Bill and Margie Hearn

to:

District3

08/18/2010 04:04 PM

Cc:

Eric.Lopez

Show Details

Councilmember Delong: This e-mail is to register our strong support for Alternative 4a-Restoration of the Colorado Lagoon. As residents of nearby Belmont Park, we enjoy walks and runs near the Colorado Lagoon, Marina Vista Park, and the Marine Stadium. Alternative 4a achieves the goal of restoring tidal circulation and wetland habitats at the lowest cost to the city. By creating a tidal creek between the lagoon and Marine Stadium, Alternative 4a will involve the least maintenance to the city and will not impact the playing fields and recreational uses at Marina Vista Park.

We strongly urge your support of Alternative 4a when it comes up for vote by the Long Beach City Council.
Thank you.

Bill and Margie Hearn
344 Monrovia Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90803

Colorado Lagoon Aternative 4a

Marion Dingman

to:

Eric.Lopez

08/18/2010 03:21 PM

Please respond to mdingman

Show Details

Please support and promote Alternative 4a for restoring the Colorado Lagoon.

Marion Dingman

204 Pomona Ave

Long Beach, CA 90803

4A

Tina Vince

to:

eric.lopez

08/18/2010 04:43 PM

Show Details

to the long beach city council c/o eric lopez

my husband and i attended a meeting last week where the options for the colorado lagoon restoration were explained. alternative 4a seems the most promising alternative...it restores full and permanent tidal circulation, it will allow native birds to thrive in the restored wetlands, provide waters for fish to breed and grow, it will beautify our park, and best of all provide healthy water for swimming (as it was when our children learned to swim there). the information presented also indicates that this plan will be the most cost effective for the city to maintain and has the best chance to secure funding.

we hope you will agree!

sincerely,

tina and jim vince

308 prospect av.

long beach, ca. 90814

colorado lagoon-channel
Robin Castro
to:
eric.lopez
08/19/2010 10:12 AM
Show Details

Dear Mr. Lopez,

I am writing in support of the channel that is being proposed to improve the circulation or the Colorado Lagoon waters. This open channel and the two bridges over it would be aesthetically nice. If the channel opens more area to free water flow that might be more easily maintained, so much the better. The issues of safety can be addressed, after all, Marine Stadium is adjacent to the sport field and there are walkways throughout.

If one looks down the coast to the Huntington Beach wetlands area, the opening of the channel to the sea has had a dramatic effect on the wildlife in the area. It is very possible the opening of a channel to our Lagoon would ignite similar results.

I am a thirty five year resident of Long Beach and I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robin Castro
311 Covina Ave
Long Beach, CA 90803

Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5379
(20100819) _____

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>




Lagoon
Barbara Ferguson to: Eric.Lopez

08/19/2010 05:22 PM

I will bet not many in LB remember the 1933 Olympic High

diving onto the sparkling clean lagoon.. I do! Bring it back with
4a!!! Barbara Ferguson, 284 Monrovia, LB 90803,438-9091



Re: Colorado Lagoon Alternative 4a 
Council District3 to: mdingman
Sent by: Joseph Toney
Cc: Eric Lopez

08/19/2010 05:02 PM

Dear Ms. Dingman,

Thank you for your email regarding the Colorado Lagoon. I will make sure that Councilmember DeLong receives your input. Furthermore, I have forwarded your letter to Eric Lopez to ensure that your comments are included with the report. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joseph D. Toney
Office of Councilmember Gary DeLong
3rd District
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6300
(562) 570-6186
www.LongBeach.Gov/District3

"Marion Dingman" Please support and vote for Alternative 4a to re... 08/19/2010 09:39:09 AM



Colorado Lagoon Alternative 4a

Marion Dingman to: District3

08/19/2010 09:39 AM

From: "Marion Dingman" <mdingman@gracelb.org>

To: <District3@LongBeach.gov>

Please respond to <mdingman@gracelb.org>

Please support and vote for Alternative 4a to restore and keep the Colorado Lagoon clean and safe.

Thank you.

Marion Dingman
204 Pomona Ave
Long Beach, CA 90803

August 19, 2010

Dear Eric Lopez,

I am writing this letter in support of Alternative 4a for the Colorado Lagoon restoration. The August 11 meeting convinced me that the positive aspects of this alternative, among which are habitat restoration, recreational benefits and educational uses, make it the best solution. The cost effectiveness over time when you combine the creation of the waterway with its maintenance costs also make the most sense, as does the conclusion that it is the most likely to secure funding. The responses by all involved in reviewing and analyzing the alternatives to the questions posed by the attendees at this meeting were clear and reassuring and provided evidence that this is the best way to proceed. The meeting ended with a strong affirmative response for Alternative 4a.

Sincerely,

Dorte Christjansen, dchristjan@fullerton.edu

Stephen Werlick

396 Park Avenue



**COMMENTS FROM LAURENCE B.GOODHUE;LONG BEACH RESIDENT
RE COLORADO LAGOON CHANNEL PROJECT:**

commonsense-sayssavthefence@fastmail.fm to: eric.lopez
Please respond to commonsense-sayssavthefence

08/20/2010 02:46 PM

This individual fully supports the OPEN CHANNEL PROJECT which will allow for:

1.Direct tidal flow and flushing into/from the Lagoon into and from the Long Beach Marine Stadium.

2.Two,eight person+coxswain rowing shells to pass one another;going to and from the Marine Stadium and the Lagoon.

A.It should be noted that the Genesis of the open channel flowed from the well spring of the City

of Long Beach's last to Olympic Bids--which were widely embraced by the the LAOC and the USOC.

The channel,while certainly not wide enough for racing,would provide access to the Lagoon which

could be used as staging,or post running room.Additionally it could also be used on a number of

the local,larger rowing events.AXIOMATIC TO SAID CONCEPT IS HAVING SUFFICIENT WIDTH FOR THE

TWO BOATS WITH OARS PASS.Racing lanes are 20 feet.Thus 40 feet width should be fine.Depth need

not be the same as required for rowing which is five(5).

B.The channel would also provide the opportunity for guided wet land/bio swell exploration by

Kayak

Let me also commend staff for advancing a,over all re arranging of existing playing fields in a manner

that yields NO LOSS OF ANY playing fields.THOUGH LET ME MAKE IT VERY CLEAR,THE SITING OF NON COASTAL

DEPENDENT ACTIVITIES--in Coastal Zones---gives rise to great concern-and SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED A

WAIVER OF THE WARRANTS WITHIN THE DICTUM OF CONTROLLING STATE COASTAL LAW.

Let me also suggest that the planning process should include a re location of the EDISON and City

electrical Transformers presently located along Eliot;It is noted said facility is CENTRAL TO 1000's

of homes-and thus is not an over night project.Nor is the cost small.(562)9818240-SCE) should yield

data which has high currency--and voltage.A fall back position would be to re locate the transformers

behind the tennis courts--WHICH ALREADY,ALAS,BLOCK THE WATER VIEW...

Laurence B.Goodhue
Long Beach
90903

--

cacrewood8@fastmail.fm



Colorado Lagoon

Lisa Rinaldi to: eric.lopez

08/28/2010 11:05 AM

8LONG BEACH City Council, FOSTER Mayor Bob, 1LONG BEACH
City Council, 9LONG BEACH City Council, 7LONG BEACH City
Council, 5LONG BEACH City Council, 4LONG BEACH City Council,
Cc: 6LONG BEACH City Council, 3LONG BEACH City Council, 2LONG
BEACH City Council, "LB REPORT LBReport.com", GRUNION
GAZETTE, LONG BEACH POST, LONG BEACH PRESS
TELEGRAM, WIELENGA Dave, friends

Dear Mr. Lopez:

Like Bolsa Chica, we have an opportunity to correct a man-made mistake and restore full tidal flow to Colorado Lagoon. The solution is Alternative 4a. set forth in the Alternative Analysis Report, Phase 2 Study, of the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project prepared by Moffat & Nichol. Restoring full tidal flow is the ultimate goal for the health of the Lagoon and ALL of the life affected by it.


I urge the City of Long Beach to select Alternative 4a.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lisa Rinaldi
5624 La Paz Street
Long Beach, CA. 90803



Re: Colorado Lagoon 
Council District3 to: JEANNE BADGLEY
Sent by: Joseph Toney
Cc: Eric Lopez

08/27/2010 04:52 PM

Dear Ms. Badgley,

Thank you for your email regarding the Colorado Lagoon. I will make sure that Councilmember DeLong receives your input. Furthermore, I have forwarded your letter to Eric Lopez to ensure that your comments are included with the report. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joseph D. Toney
Office of Councilmember Gary DeLong
3rd District
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6300
(562) 570-6186
www.LongBeach.Gov/District3

"JEANNE BADGLEY" Dear Councilman DeLong, As a 50 year resi...

08/27/2010 02:32:28 PM



Colorado Lagoon

JEANNE BADGLEY to: District3

08/27/2010 02:32 PM

From: "JEANNE BADGLEY" <jeannebadgley@verizon.net>

To: <District3@LongBeach.gov>

Dear Councilman DeLong,

As a 50 year resident of the Third District, I am hopeful that the City make the necessary improvements to restore full tidal circulation to the Colorado Lagoon by selecting Alternative 4a.

Thank you for your support,
Jeanne E. Badgley



203 Argonne, Ste B #140
Long Beach, CA 90803-1777
(562) 261-9058
www.coloradolagoon.org
Email: Friends@coloradolagoon.org

Friends of Colorado Lagoon

A coalition of concerned citizens working to preserve and restore Colorado Lagoon

August 31, 2010

Board of Directors

President

Dave Pirazzi

Vice President

Norman Zoref

Secretary

Sue Considine

Treasurer

Rich Sonnenberg

Board Members

Heather Altman

Helene Ansel

Adrianne Bosler

Cindy Desatoff

Andy Kincaid

Laurie Pekich

Tina Pirazzi

Becky Thorn

Dr. Nicole Thorn

Ray Thorn

Dr. Christine Whitcraft

Restoration Director

Eric Zahn

Education Director

Taylor Parker

Tax ID number:

33-0968096

Re: Colorado Lagoon Phase 2 Study

Dear Mr. Lopez,

Friends of Colorado Lagoon (FOCL) has extensively analyzed the Phase 2 restoration study and strongly recommends Alternative 4a as the best option for optimally restoring the Colorado Lagoon and improving the surrounding area.

Alternative 4a is a gently sloping beautiful tidal creek meandering through Marina Vista Park with bridges designed for both Colorado St. and Elliot St. Of all the alternatives proposed, 4a provides the most diverse recreational opportunities, enhances Marina Vista Park for no net loss of playing fields and restores the most natural habitat making it the most attractive to funding agencies. Alternative 4a also requires the least maintenance in the long term resulting in the lowest overall cost to the city. Friends of Colorado Lagoon has recently championed this option at the Marine Advisory Committee meeting, the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting and the August 11th public meeting for this study.

While all of the studied alternatives provide full tidal exchange resulting in improved water quality (pg. 79), necessary for safe recreation and habitat improvement, alternative 4A offers several significant benefits over the other options:

Alternative 4A offers Fundability, Sustainability, Affordability and Connect-ability.

- **Fundability** - Alternative 4a was included in the study at the recommendation of participating resource agencies (pg.26) who are also potential funding sources. Additionally since it would restore (pgs. 5, 7) the most lost wetlands habitat, it will provide the most mitigation credits, and will therefore be the most attractive to potential funders while the chance to secure monies for another underground culvert is not likely (pgs. 55-56).
- **Sustainability** - A wide channel with bridges and gently sloping edges as designed in 4a is the most sustainable for the natural wetlands habitat facilitating the natural spread of eelgrass and cord grass through the channel and into Colorado Lagoon, which are vital for healthy marine habitats (Appendix B, Alt 4 Conceptual Cross Section). Flow velocities are lowest with Alternative 4a (pg. 47), which along with the vegetative buffer create a scenic and safe tidal creek requiring the least maintenance to keep clean and beautiful.
- **Affordability** - While the estimated construction costs for Alternative 4a are the highest (pg. 67), this funding will be born by grants, not the City. Costs that will be born by the City are the long-term maintenance costs (pg. 72) where Alternative 4A is the least expensive to the City of Long Beach over the long-term.



203 Argonne, Ste B #140
Long Beach, CA 90803-1777
(562) 261-9058
www.coloradolagoon.org
Email: Friends@coloradolagoon.org

Friends of Colorado Lagoon

A coalition of concerned citizens working to preserve and restore Colorado Lagoon

Board of Directors

President

Dave Pirazzi

Vice President

Norman Zoref

Secretary

Sue Considine

Treasurer

Rich Sonnenberg

Board Members

Heather Altman

Helene Ansel

Adrianne Bosler

Cindy Desatoff

Andy Kincaid

Laurie Pekich

Tina Pirazzi

Becky Thorn

Dr. Nicole Thorn

Ray Thorn

Dr. Christine Whitcraft

Restoration Director

Eric Zahn

Education Director

Taylor Parker

- **Connect-ability** - By creating a Tidal Creek that restores the natural flow of water from Alamitos Bay to Colorado Lagoon, we are further connecting the Lagoon habitat with the Los Cerritos Wetlands and Jack Dunster Marine Reserve. Alternative 4a will help connect and educate the community about our vital interdependence with wetlands and the ocean (FOCL's 5,741 volunteer hours in the past 22 months demonstrates this value) while complying with the Local Coastal Plan that prioritizes water-oriented recreational activities over those that can be provided inland (Section 30220).
- **Other factors** – Alternative 4a will lead to enhancement of Marina Vista Park playing fields through reconfiguration while no playing fields will be lost. The study estimated a loss of 12-15% of playing space (pg. i), but it did not take into account an elevation change crossing the Park that is 96-108 feet-wide, which will be flattened, converting it into playing space resulting in only an approximate 2-5% loss of playing space.

FOCL greatly appreciates the thoroughness of the assessment conducted by Moffatt & Nichol; and the public engagement championed by Councilmember DeLong and carried out by Eric Lopez of Community Development in conjunction with the Parks, Recreation, and Marine Department and Commission, and the Marine Advisory Committee.

FOCL has long been committed to restoring the Colorado Lagoon. The City of Long Beach has enjoyed much success with the Colorado Lagoon restoration project through diligent and thoughtful work, and Alternative 4a is the natural extension of this innovative collaborative effort.

Sincerely,

Dave Pirazzi,
President, FOCL

Tax ID number:

33-0968096

Belmont Heights Community Association

375 Redondo Avenue #332

Long Beach, CA 90814

www.mybelmontheights.org

August 28, 2010

Mayor Bob Foster
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Blvd., 14th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

RE: Support of the Colorado Lagoon Wetlands Restoration Project

Dear Mr. Mayor:

The Board of the Belmont Heights Community Association (BHCA) strongly supports the Colorado Lagoon Wetlands Restoration Project. Specifically, the Board supports the position of the Friends of the Colorado Lagoon (FOCL), as well as many members of the community at large, in calling for an open channel approach for phase two of the project, referred to as option 4a in the City's Planning documents.

As you know, the Colorado Lagoon is one of the last surviving vestiges of coastal wetlands habitat in Long Beach. According to FOCL, 98% of the Salt Marsh Habitat within the Los Cerritos Wetlands, the terminus of the San Gabriel River Watershed, has been destroyed. While this project is small in terms of acreage restored, it must be considered in the context of the scarcity of coastal wetlands in Los Angeles County, where less than 5 percent of this ecosystem's historic acreage remains undeveloped. The project will create upland and transitional habitat that does not exist in the County, and restore healthy intertidal habitat that is also very sparse. Restoring an urban lagoon / wetland is critical to educating people about our vital interdependency with nature.

Furthermore, Colorado Lagoon is ranked as one of the most polluted beaches in California. Closures of the Lagoon due to unacceptable bacteria levels are increasingly frequent. Wildlife diversity has also suffered because of the accumulation of pollutants. In fact, the most polluted areas of the Lagoon have markedly fewer species and numbers of fish, invertebrate, and wetland plants and animals. Without question, tidal flow into the Lagoon is critical to improving water quality and the attenuated benefits of such.

There has been much discussion in the community about what approach should be taken to increase flow to the Lagoon. After listening to those who have researched the issue, the open channel approach offers the most effective long-term approach. Furthermore, it has been determined that restoring the Lagoon through the open channel option dramatically increases the chances of securing funding to complete the work. Although an open channel approach may be more expensive to construct, it is one of the least expensive options regarding long-term maintenance.

In summary, the board of the BHCA, as well as many members of our community, strongly supports an open channel option, specifically 4a, for the second phase of the Colorado Lagoon restoration project.

Sincerely,

Dianne Sundstrom

Dianne Sundstrom
President
Belmont Heights Community Association

cc: Gary DeLong, Councilman, 3rd District
All Council members
Eric Lopez, Analyst, Property Services Bureau, Department of Community
Development

Marina Vista Channel project
Raquel & Robert Kleinhenz
to:
gary.delong, eric.lopez, mark.sandoval
09/08/2010 11:22 AM
Show Details

To Whom it may concern,

I support improving the health of the Colorado Lagoon with the parallel culvert, but I am opposed to an open channel through Marina Vista Park.

Sincerely,

**Raquel Landworth-Kleinhenz
Dr. Robert Kleinhenz**

370 Mira Mar Ave,
90814



DEVELOPMENT, INC.

CONSTRUCTION * MANAGEMENT * DESIGN

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Colorado Lagoon – Marina Vista Park
Parallel Culvert vs. Open Channel

I support improving the health of the Colorado Lagoon with the Parallel Culvert. I am totally opposed to an open channel through Marina Vista Park.

I have read the EIR and the benefits/pros for the Parallel Culvert are so overwhelming that I am shocked the open channel is even a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Monte Cofell
President

Residence:
262 Roycroft Ave.,
Long Beach, CA 90803

TERESA KELLEY
to:
Eric.Lopez
08/31/2010 09:49 PM
[Show Details](#)

August 31, 2010

Dear Eric Lopez,

I have attached my comments, concerns and questions regarding the "Alternatives Analysis report, Phase 2 Study, Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project". If you have problem opening the document up please let me know.

Sincerely,

Terry Kelley, P.E.

August 31, 2010

Dear Eric Lopez,

The following are comments, concerns and questions that I have regarding the "Alternatives Analysis report, Phase 2 Study, Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project". I was unable to make the August 11 meeting because I was on vacation with my family. I appreciate you taking the time to go through my following comments, concerns and questions at this time.

Executive Summary

It says that 12 to 15% of park will be taken for the open channel alternatives; but what is the percent amount of space the open channel will take of open FLAT space for recreation uses. Much of the park is rolling hills with many trees. These areas can't be used for recreation.

Page 1, Paragraph 1

When are the studies going to be conducted to monitor the tidal flows and water quality after the existing culvert is cleaned out? Are we not jumping to conclusions that the existing culvert is inadequate because flows are being impeded by sediment because the culvert was never maintained? Shouldn't this information be gathered over for a period of at least one year after the completion of Phase 1 to be able to make a well informed decision on what alternative, if any is necessary to pursue in Phase 2.

Page 13, Paragraph 1

Has a model been done to verify that the tidal range will increase 1 foot? If so can I get a copy of the model data and results?

Page 16; Figure 2-2 and page5 of Appendix A

Did the vertical alignments for the proposed bridges studied only use aerial topography or more detailed survey? How does Eliot Street connect to Colorado? (Where is it's profile.) What are the sight distances from westbound Colorado going over the raised roadway bridge? What are sight distances for traffic on Elliot traveling to Westbound Colorado? Our school children cross at Colorado and Eliot to cross by the fire station on their way to our schools, Lowell and Rogers. This is LBUUSD and our neighborhood SAFE route.

What impact does raising the road at Colorado and Eliot have on the local streets (i.e. Elliot, Nieto, Orlena, Panama), Colorado Lagoon Playgroup's driveway and the Orlena park? Such as sight distances along the proposed vertical alignment.

Page 19, paragraph 4

Is the eelgrass planned to cover the entire bottom of the channel? If so, does the grass impede the tidal flows and limit the use of small (row and kayak) boats from entering and using the channel; as some local people wish to do from previous meeting comments?

Page 19, last paragraph and Page 22 paragraph 3

What fencing are you requiring at those steep slopes near the bridges? Some sort of fencing has to be provided. Again, our children will be walking along these bridges and top of these steep slopes DAILY when school starts. In my experience with drainage projects the only fencing that provides the safety necessary to protect our children will be UGLY 6 foot chain link fence; the same fencing used for safety along the steep parts of the Lagoon currently in use at the little park at Orlena and Colorado.

Section 2.2.1

See comments for Page 1, Paragraph 1 above.

Page 22, last paragraph

Where would the lift station be located?

Section 3.1.1

So what you are saying the open channel should be designed in the future to the dimensions of the theoretical channel because it will form to the theoretical channel dimensions? Not the proposed alternative damsons? Why is the report then even proposing the dimensions in Alternatives 2 through 4?

Page 30, last paragraph

Wouldn't the culverts be free of sediment deposits under the report's conclusion "... there is no longer a mechanism for large-scale channel avulsion due to sedimentation..." thus maintenance would not be an issue because of the self-flushing of the tidal movement and conclusions in the report's 'Sediment Supply' section.

Table 3-4, page 38

Why is Alternative 2 the only alternative shown in this table? Shouldn't all the alternatives be represented? And what are the values for the other alternatives?

Figure 3-8 and Section 3.4.2.

The examples given showed no dense vegetation atop a channel with sloped sides. So how are these pictures relevant to the open channel alternatives proposed for this project? The proposed sections for the open channels show depths of 13+ feet. Past reports show these beautiful renditions showing vegetation of heights of half an adult's height and dense plantings. This type of vegetation will hide children from parents view! You cannot compare this to gradually sloping beaches and wetland banks with wide open views!

This type of vegetation will also hide transients. We already have them camping out at the mini park at the southeast corner of 7th and Park. The proposed sections with vegetation will

become a hiding area for them. To keep children safe and prevent transients from taking shelter in the vegetation wouldn't a 6 foot chain link fence would have to be erected? These are ugly and detract from our areas' open beauty.

Times for objects to float down the channel are irrelevant when you cannot see the objects "children" from the banks because of dense vegetation.

I don't ever remember hearing reports of children going down culverts but we always hear reports of children being swept away and/or drowning in open channels.

Have you seen the chain link fence along the southeast end of the lagoon adjacent to the little park at the corner of Orlena and Colorado? It is located on the steep embankment.

"Natural-looking fence(s)" do not stop children from crawling over or under them.

"Low shrubbery" grows very fast in our area and never stays low unless pruned every year.

"Low shrubbery" hides small children from view.

Who is maintaining this "low shrubbery" to ensure it will not get overgrown and the channel could be seen at all times?

3.4.4.

If Federal funding is used for any portion of the project will the Federal government allow the freeboard of the channel under the bridges to be eliminated?

3.5

Project costs for Alternative 2 seem low considering it has 2 bridges and a lift station? What is the cost of the lift station? What is the maintenance costs of the lift station? Who is maintaining it and will there be adverse noise associated with the lift station?

Table 3-14

Why not show a table of cost per acre of recreational land being taken away?

Conclusion

I sincerely believe your costs are not accurate and a more detailed estimate will reveal this.

Thank you for taking the time to review my questions and comments.

Sincerely,

Teresa Kelley, P.E.

Virginia Kortz
to:
Eric.Lopez
09/03/2010 12:33 PM
[Show Details](#)

Dear Eric:

As you are aware, I am in support of the second culvert option in the plan for improving the Colorado Lagoon. I want this forwarded to the appropriate entities prior to the Parks & Recreation/Marine taking a final vote on this issue.

My rationale for this as you know is that this option is a viable one with the least negative impact, least cost and most importantly, keeps the "active" park use for all the community which is presently using the park.

I drive on Colorado every day at least once a day. Within the last week, I have observed no less than 11 groups of children, some formal and many informal, using the park for soccer and baseball practice and adult groups using it for games of cricket on the week-end. There is absolutely no way a "250" foot waterway will serve the needs for which the park was initially planned.

Recall, this was all part of the SEADIP plan and was a trade-off for the increased density to allow the developers to construct the housing units south of Colorado. The trade-off was to have green belt areas and also alot land for a park.

Please have my comments included in whatever is presented to either the Commision and/or City Council.

Thank you.

Virginia M. Kortz
357 Ultimo Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814

Phase 2 Study Analysis

Matt Kirk

to:

Eric.Lopez, Gary DeLong, Mark.Sandoval

09/07/2010 05:38 PM

Cc:

"Virginia Kortz", "Michaels Family", craig, "TERESA KELLEY", dpn3

Show Details

Please review the To: and CC: fields, if your email address is not correct please contact the sender. Please ask them to update their address book or contact list with the proper format, firstname.lastname@longbeach.gov
Thank you.

Mark, Eric,

Please provide this to the Marine Advisory Commission.

Sincerely,

Matthew Kirk, P.E.

MK Engineering Group

3621 S. Harbor Blvd. Ste. 100

Santa Ana, CA 92704

Main (657) 622-2100

Direct (714) 460-7259

PHASE 2 STUDY REBUTTAL

Prepared By: Matthew Kirk, P.E.

This is a rebuttal to the PHASE 2 Study for the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project. I am a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of California (No. 51619) and have over 25 years experience in the design of projects in Southern California, many of them with multiple facilities that function together similar to the ones analyzed here.

I have reviewed the report and have noted numerous concerns with the accuracy of statements and cost estimates presented in the report. I will briefly note some of those statements and state how I feel it is inaccurate. I reviewed the cost estimates provided and found it difficult to provide a detailed analysis due to lack of detail on how the estimates were created. My analysis focused on specific line items with a breakdown of those items if someone wishes to review my estimates.

The table on page 60 indicates that Alt.4 footprint is 15% of the total Marina Vista Park (MVP) space, I agree with that assessment but the issue is that approximately 50% of MVP is active sports field and that is where the channel is located so the channel removes approximately 30% of the active space of MVP, the cost analysis is silent on the cost of replacement of those 2.7 acres that were once active sports field. The other major omission from the report was the impact to Concerts in the Park a revenue generation source.

Cost per Habitat Acre does not list the areas created and/or upgraded per alternative making a direct comparison difficult. Post Phase 1 work is clearly to most cost effective because no more capital costs and maintenance is essentially \$0. If the water quality of the Lagoon reaches target levels (that have not been published) of Marine Stadium then no further work need be completed. In order for the Colorado Lagoon to become a health functioning wetland full tidal flush is not required. The cost analysis needs to include cost of replacement of the area lost to active space.

Page 54 states "Given the relatively small size of the habitat area and the few areas of similar habitat nearby, the tidal wetland area is not likely to be significant in terms of support for sensitive bird species" and from page 59 "there was no significant difference at the end of the five year monitoring period" for fish populations using culverts to move. The report is full of these types of statements that seem to support the conclusion that cost should drive the decision.

The table below tried to put some of the key components together for a quick review of the Alternatives.

	Post Phase I	Alt. 1 Parallel Culvert	Alt. 2 Open Channel with Bridges	Alt. 3 Combination Open Channel and Culverts	Alt. 4 Combination Open Channel (Maximum Wetlands)	Alt. 4a Open Channel (Maximum Wetlands) with Bridges
Percentage of Tide Range to Open Ocean (8.2')	71% (5.8')	96% (7.9')	95% (7.8')	98% (8.0')	98% (8.0')	95% (7.8') Assume same as Alt. 2
Trees Removed	0	15 (10 Palm)	23 (10 Palm)	20 (10 Palm)	20 (10 Palm)	23 (10 Palm) Same as Alt. 2
Material to export	0	7,200 cy	45,000 cy	26,000 cy	40,000 cy	50,000+ cy Similar to Alt. 2 with more export
Utilities relocated	0	0	6	0	0	6
Acres of Wetlands created or upgraded	18.2	18.2	18.2+1.98= 20.18	18.2+1.47= 19.67	18.2+2.21= 20.41	18.2+2.4= 20.6
Capital Cost (per report/as adjusted)	\$0/\$0	\$6801/\$4793	\$9005/\$9505	\$5779/\$4590	\$7329/\$6525	\$9408/\$9908

It is apparent that Phase I is the most effective on a cost per acre of wetland enhanced. Phase I clearly does the heavy lifting for the health of the lagoon and any project beyond Phase I provides nominal improvements for the money spent (the point of diminishing returns). Phase I diverts nutrient rich low flows away from the lagoon, enhances the tidal flush by cleaning the existing culvert, and removes contaminated sediment from the lagoon. It seems the most prudent course of action would be to provide improvements on an incremental basis and assess the success of each action before any further action is taken.

Given that capital and ongoing costs are important any alternative that removes active park space from Marina Vista Park should provide the cost to replace that same amount of space within the immediate vicinity and should be funded prior to removal of the active space.

I recommend the Alternatives in the following order.

1. Post Phase 1 work (monitor water quality)
2. Alt. 1 (Parallel Culvert)

The remaining are all cost prohibitive regardless of funding source.

3. Alt. 3 (Open Channel with Culverts)
4. Alt. 2 (Open Channel with Bridges)
5. Alt. 4 (Open Channel with Maximum Wetland)
6. Alt. 4a. (Open Channel with Maximum Wetland and Bridges)

PHASE 2 STUDY COST ESTIMATE REBUTTAL

The following cost estimate is the tabulation of the numbers provided in the report in the left side column and the numbers on the right (red) are estimated based on preliminary costs from contractors familiar with that type of construction. The cost shown in the report did not provide a breakdown of the numbers, in the interest of simplicity, I analyzed the numbers that did not appear reasonable and provided a breakdown for culvert numbers for independent check. The numbers in (green) is an estimated cost for a sewage lift station (5500 gallons per minute) based on engineers estimates. The number in (blue) is the revised capital cost estimate.

The report estimated replacement of the grass for Alt. 1 to be \$322,000 and all the other options that not only replaced a significant amount of grass it also landscaped the channel area and relocated a softball field with fencing and hardscape for less money. Assuming two acres of grass to be replaced by hydroseed at \$0.25 per sf the revised number seems more reasonable.

The utility replacement estimate of \$688,000 is grossly understated by at least \$1 million. The EIR did not address the existence of a 27" Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) sewer main and the Phase 2 report has barely acknowledged it's existence. Using a rule of thumb estimate for a sewer of that size the pump station may have to handle up to 5500 gallons per minute. The report does not mention if LACSD has been contacted about pump station requirements and /or typical maintenance costs. A typical pump station of this size will require an emergency generator, explosion alarms, high level alarms, odor control systems and a structure for equipment above grade. When all the safety requirements fail the overflow will enter the Colorado Lagoon and Marine Stadium.

Post Phs I	Alt. 1		Alt. 2		Alt. 3		Alt. 4		Alt. 4a	
	Report	Est.	Report	Est.	Report	Est.	Report	Est.	Report	Est.
Mobilization	0	425		675		363		519		695
Construct Channel	0			2103		1135		1729		2211
Construct Bridge(s)	0			2496				1240		2496
Install new Culvert	0	3750	1408			1831	689	817	304	
Relocate Utils	0	63		688	1000	63		63		688
Replace Grass	0	322	100							1000
ports Field Reconfig	0			313		276		302		312
uct New Restrooms	0	953	500	953	500	953	500	953	500	500
move Exist. Culvert	0							341		341
Other Work	0	155		276		195		144		144
CM and Markup	0	1133		1501		963		1221		1568
	0	6801	4793	9005	9505	5779	4590	7329	6525	9408
										9908

Culvert Cost Est. Alt. 1	Quant.	units	cost/unit	Total
Soil removal	7200	cy	\$35	\$252,000
Culvert Const. 3.5cy/ft	880	lf	\$1,200	\$1,056,000
Inlet/outlet	2	ea	\$50,000	\$100,000
				\$1,408,000

Culvert Cost Est. Alt. 3				
	Quant.	units	cost/unit	Total
Soil removal	3000	cy	\$35	\$105,000
Culvert Const. 3.5cy/ft	320	lf	\$1,200	\$384,000
Inlet/outlet	4	ea	\$50,000	\$200,000
				\$689,000

Culvert Cost Est. Alt. 4				
	Quant.	units	cost/unit	Total
Soil removal	1200	cy	\$35	\$42,000
Culvert Const. 3.5cy/ft	135	lf	\$1,200	\$162,000
Inlet/outlet	2	ea	\$50,000	\$100,000
				\$304,000

Summary of cost analysis

The most cost effective solution would be to wait and see if the Phase I improvements achieve an acceptable water quality for the lagoon. Given that increased tidal flushing, local non storm water low flow and Termino Ave storm drain have been diverted away from the lagoon the most prudent approach would be to wait and see how the lagoon ecosystem reacts to this improved environment before spending additional funds to capture marginal improvements that may not be measureable.

If Phase II becomes necessary the parallel culvert construction cost is roughly half that of the 4a alternative. Given the fact that such a critical component such as the sewer lift station, required for Alt. 4a, has been all but overlooked and the costs associated with it begs the question of what else has been missed or overlooked. Alt. 4a is a large complex construction effort with may opportunities for cost overruns that may or may not be picked up by the granting agency.

Maintenance costs

The report lists maintenance for Alt. 1 over 50 years to be \$8.4M and Alt. 4a to be \$4.0M. This analysis defies logic that a passive structure (culvert) will have a higher annual cost to maintain than two bridges fences and a 5500* gallon per minute (approx. 75hp) sewage lift station and the power required to keep the pumps running and emergency generator requiring testing approximately once every two weeks.

Clean new culvert in 10 years \$500,000 add \$100,000 to the cost for each subsequent cleaning the total is \$3.5M say \$1M to clean existing culvert at that time amounts to \$4.5M over 50 years not \$8.5M.

Alt. 4a at the end of the 50 year life expectancy the bridges will require reconstruction, the sewage lift station will require new pumps approximately every 10 years, fencing to protect the channel will be replaced every 20 years, the emergency generator will be replaced twice during the 50 years. The items not anticipated are paying LA County Sanitation District for manpower required to maintain the sewage lift station, the cost of electricity* to run the station, and what if the channel needs to be dredged. The cost alone for lift station electricity is approx. \$36,000 per year, time to test emergency generator 4 hours every two weeks at \$100 / hr - \$20,000 /year.

Moffatt & Nichol needs to provide backup to justify why the maintenance of a passive structure is twice that of dynamic facilities that require power and testing numerous times during the year.

Sewage Lift Station

*5500 Gallons per minute peak flow based on 27" pipe flowing 75% full at a slope of 0.25 %

Gorman - Rupp submersible pump 10" model JS10AA60-X76

76 horsepower requires 55 KW will provide 30 feet of head

Power consumption based on the pump is estimated to be

55KW x 12 hrs/day x 30 days = 19,800 KWH

Assume cost of KWH = \$0.15 19800x.15=\$2970

The estimated monthly cost of electricity (w/o peak load rates) is \$2970.

Analysis of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – Open Channel vs. Parallel Culvert

This report will provide a side by side comparison of the open channel vs. the parallel culvert option as described in the EIR as Alternative 3 “Recreation Alternative”. It will identify specific components of Phase I and II that can be modified or eliminated and still meet all project objectives. According to the EIR “the parallel culvert would be the same size as the existing culvert”. The parallel culvert as described achieves over 90% of the tidal flush values of the open channel option. In conversations with the City an assertion was made that a parallel culvert could match the OC in flow volume. The City asked M&N to comment on the assertion, per an email, dated 9/09/08 (attached), Moffat and Nichol agrees that a parallel culvert can match the flow of the open channel, “I don’t disagree with him that we could achieve the same tidal flushing with a second parallel culvert”.

In the analysis below OC is used as an abbreviation for the open channel and PC is used for the parallel culvert.

Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

There are fundamental differences between the OC and PC options that will percolate through most if not all of the mitigation measures. The discussion below will identify three fundamental differences and discuss the impact those differences have on the mitigation measures. The discussion will show what mitigation measures are at a minimum the same (impact), what reduce the required mitigation measure (impact) or completely eliminate the need for mitigation. The analysis will clearly show that construction of the PC alternative has substantially less impact on the surrounding community than the OC.

A comparison of the parallel culvert and open channel yield the following conditions that will have an impact on all mitigation measures in terms of **duration of construction**, **total disturbed area**, and impact on **water quality** as a result of the means and methods of construction required for the two options.

Duration of Construction – Duration of construction of the open channel is not stated in Section 3.0. Based on the description of the construction process and assuming no delays in construction the open could be constructed in 8 – 12 weeks. The bridge construction, according to Section 3.5.1, will take 6 months each for a total of 12 months. Total construction time for the open channel 14-15 months minimum. The most probable duration would be 18 months (based on professional opinion).

The parallel culvert construction duration using precast concrete box sections could be completed within 8 weeks, of initial excavation, including inlet and outlet structures. The portions across the roadways could be installed within a week each. A cast in place box culvert could be completed within 16 weeks. These time frames have been discussed with two contractors and deemed reasonable based on the description of the project.

The most likely delays that could happen from a construction stand point are: adverse soil conditions, and delays due to weather and a delay do to presence of a sea turtle or marine mammal within 500m as prescribed in mitigation measure BIO-10. The adverse soil condition would cause a delay in either alternative. The PC removes much less soil than the OC and thus would be less liable to encounter adverse (or possible toxic) soil conditions. The same is true for weather, a shorter duration project is at less risk of being delayed than a longer duration project.

The PC can be constructed in a much shorter time frame and is less likely to be affected by unknown conditions and adverse weather. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that any mitigation measure could be shortened by at least 10 months with the PC construction as opposed to the OC construction

Total disturbed area - Open channel and softball field construction requires construction activities in the area bound by the walking trail on the west to the back of sidewalk along Eliot Street on the southerly and easterly sides and to the back of sidewalk of Colorado Street on the north, approximately 6ac. Parallel culvert construction could be done within a 150' wide strip of land adjacent to the existing culvert alignment, approximately 3ac. With a total disturbed area approximately ½ of the OC construction machinery will spend less time working the disturbed area. Dust control, clearing operations, tree removal, and construction traffic, will be greatly reduced for a smaller area. Approximately 20 trees will not be removed with the PC construction an analysis of the carbon footprint comparison would be a interesting exercise for a project ½ area and ¼ the duration.

It is counter intuitive to suggest a total disturbed area of 6 ac for up to 16 months would have less impact than 3ac for 4 months. The reduction in trees being removed alone is sufficient to determine the PC is a significantly less disruptive project than the OC.

Water Quality During Construction – Section 3.5.1 indicates the “existing culvert will be demolished as part of the open channel construction” and that “The culvert will be opened once every two weeks during construction” “for 2 to 3 days”. During this time the construction “may lead to stagnation and water quality problems”. The mitigation measure for this is to install “two subsurface aeration systems”. The construction of the OC will have a detrimental impact on water quality of the lagoon during construction, a clear contradiction to two Project Objective stated in Section 3.4 of the EIR one to “Improve water quality by increasing the Lagoon’s circulation” and the other to “Enhance public enjoyment of the Lagoon”. The Lagoon will be closed to swimming during most of the construction duration. It also discusses that if construction is performed during the wet months the construction would need to be delayed to allow storm flows through the channel thus further delaying completion of the OC. These may be unavoidable impacts in construction of the OC but they are non-existent impacts with the PC.

PC construction can be completed with no impact to existing circulation (or improved circulation of the cleaned culvert). PC construction does not require the demolition of the

existing lifeline that is the existing culvert, for the lagoon. Inlet structures can be built behind coffer dams at each end of the culvert and sealed to prevent water from moving beyond the headwalls until the connection is completed. During construction of the PC the existing culvert (cleaned or not) can maintain the lifeline the lagoon has today, no decrease in water quality for this alternative. No Project Objectives are compromised by this alternative.

The PC construction has a net no impact on water quality and the OC construction has a net negative impact on water quality.

Many of the mitigation measures discuss a grading permit being required for the OC, a grading permit is not necessarily required for the PC. For this discussion it will be assumed a grading permit will be obtained for the PC.

The following comments are to the issues documented in Table 7.A of the EIR. This table is attached for reference and comparison.

AES -1: Parallel culvert (PC) construction has a smaller total disturbed area and removes 20000 fewer trees. The screening requirements would only apply to a smaller area and for a shorter duration. The PC impact is substantially less than the OC.

AES-2 Relocation of restrooms not required for PC. Mitigation measure not required for OC.

AQ-1 See **Short-Term Construction-Related Noise Impacts** above. The PC requires approximately 1/5th the soil removal as the OC. At 1/5th of the export required for the OC the PC impact is substantially less than the OC.

AQ-2 The PC would have the same requirements but for a significantly shorter time frame. The PC impact is substantially less than the OC.

AQ-3 Same as AQ-2.

AQ-4 Same as AQ-2.

AQ-5 Same as AQ-2.

AQ-6 Same as AQ-2.

AQ-7 Same as AQ-2. The majority of the PC construction is beyond the 250' limit.

AQ-8 Same as AQ-2. The PC would require a much smaller volume of "dredged" material than the OC.

BIO-1 Same impact, reduced area of impact for PC may increase chance of not disturbing specimen.

BIO-2 Fewer trees are removed for PC and minor modifications to phase I could avoid (minimize) removal of palms. PC impacts are significantly less than the OC.

BIO-3 Same

BIO-4 Same

BIO-5 Same

BIO-6 The PC construction can be completed within 135 and eelgrass mitigation could be completed as prescribed. OC construction will exceed 135 days may require additional eelgrass mitigation.

BIO-7 Same

BIO-8 The reduced time frame for PC construction minimizes the exposure of construction stoppage as a result of the presence of the listed marine animals.

BIO-9 Same as BIO-8.

BIO-10 Same as BIO-8.

BIO-11 Same as BIO-8.

BIO-12 The reduced construction time and disturbed area for the PC greatly reduces the possible impacts for this measure. The PC is at much less risk of being delayed.

BIO-13 Slight modifications to the project can greatly reduce the number of trees being mitigated thus reducing the possibility of the new trees not meeting the prescribed guidelines. The PC avoids the removal of at least 20??? trees. The PC impact is significantly less than the OC.

CULT-1 The majority of the area to be disturbed is artificial fill the likely hood of the discovery of archaeological materials is minimal. The PC has a much smaller disturbed area therefore the chances are reduced further.

CULT-2 Same as CULT-1.

CULT-3 Same as CULT-1.

GEO-1 The PC will not required slope protection measures as required for the OC. Erosion will only be an issue for the banks of the open channel and around the

bridge piers and footings. The geological issues are significantly less for the PC than for the OC.

GEO-2 Same

HAZ-1 The PC has significantly less soil removal required therefore the chance for encounter is significantly reduced. The PC impact is significantly less than the OC.

HAZ-2 Same

HAZ-3 The PC has significantly less construction duration and soil removal therefore the exposure or encounter with toxic substances is minimized. The PC impact is significantly less than the OC.

HAZ-4 Same as HAZ-3.

WQ-1 The PC has reduced construction duration and total disturbed area than the OC. Construction of the OC will require more reporting requirements to the State Regional Board for the longer construction time (1 year+). The PC impact on water quality is significantly less than the OC.

WQ-2 Same as WQ-1.

WQ-3 Same.

WQ-4 Not required for PC construction. The existing culvert can remain open during the PC construction. Water quality of the lagoon will **not** be negatively impacted by PC construction.

WQ-5 The shorter duration of PC construction possible dewatering necessity is minimized. Note: The determination of "discharge to the storm drain system or surface waters" seems mute, since all storm drains drain directly to surface waters. A more practical mitigation measure would be to require all water from dewatering operations discharge to the closest surface water via a three cell (tank) separator system.

WQ-6 Same

WQ-7 The reduced amount of soil removal for the PC minimizes this impact.

WQ-8 Same as WQ-7.

WQ-9 Same as WQ-4. If water quality is unsafe for recreational use it will not likely be as a result of construction related activities of the PC.

NOI-1 The PC can be constructed without the use of pile driving activities. Pile driving activities can be completely eliminated with minor changes to phase I

components. Pile driving activities are listed as the “noisiest activity on site” in Section 4.9.5 **Short-Term Construction-Related Noise Impacts**. The reduced time of construction and reduced disturbed area and minimal noise generation makes the PC an overwhelmingly superior alternative to the OC. The PC has significantly less impact than the OC.

NOI-2 The reduced time of construction and reduced disturbed area and minimal noise generation makes the PC an overwhelmingly superior alternative to the OC. The PC has significantly less impact than the OC.

NOI-3 Same as NOI-2.

NOI-4 Same as NOI-2.

NOI-5 Same as NOI-1.

NOI-6 Same as NOI-2.

PSU-1 Not required. The PC will maintain the existing surface features save the two new inlet/outlet structures of the PC.

PSU-2 Same. Note: Using reclaimed water on a water quality improvement project seems counterproductive.

PSU-3 The PC can be constructed with precast concrete sections with minimal formwork required at the inlet/outlet structures. Precasting will be done offsite thus minimizing any sacrificial material use. The PC has significantly less impact than the OC.

REC-1 The reduced time of construction and reduced disturbed area and minimal water quality impacts will minimize Lagoon closures compared to the OC. The PC significantly reduces the impact as compared to the OC.

REC-2 The reduced time of construction and reduced disturbed area minimizes the impact to Marina Vista Park and thus all groups, leagues and local residents. Note: “other nearby available City parks” are not nearby and not available during the peak use time. The next closest City park with similar amenities is more than two miles away (Whaley Park). The EIR only analyzed the “permitted use” of the park not the actual use of the park. Some of the activities may be temporarily relocated during construction while many will be permanently gone after the park is divided by the OC. The PC has significantly less impact on Marina Vista Park than the OC.

TR-1 The PC can be constructed across Colorado Street and Eliot Street in a matter of weeks as opposed to six months each for bridge construction at each street. The reduced duration of construction and reduced soil removal minimizes any traffic disruption as a result of construction. The PC significantly reduces the impact as compared to the OC.

The above analysis clearly shows that for every mitigation measure the impact, of the PC, is either equal to the impact, of the OC, or significantly reduced and in some cases nonexistent. The reduced impact of the PC is most dramatic in many of the most offensive impacts. Any impact related to noise, length of impact, water quality, air quality, traffic, and disruption to the community is reduced with the PC alternative.

Section 4.9.5

Short-Term Construction-Related Vibration Impacts.

Section 4.9.5 states "The closest pile driving activities to a sensitive receptor would occur at a distance of 112 ft from the residential uses located near the intersection of East Colorado Street and Orlena Avenue." According to Figure 4.9.1 the nearest pile driving activities appear to be much less than the 112 ft as described in the EIR. It appears the distance would be approximately half that stated in the EIR. The use of "Equation 9 and Table 17 from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) *Transportation and Construction- Induced Vibration Guidance Manual* (Jones & Stokes, June 2004)" should be reapplied using a distance of 50 ft as opposed to the 112 ft discussed. Will the threshold of 0.1 in/sec (for architectural damage) be exceeded with the shorter distance? If so, the statement of "the proposed project would not result in any significant vibration impacts" would be erroneous.

This would not be an issue with culvert construction. Pile driving will not be required.

Short-Term Construction-Related Noise Impacts.

Not removing the North parking area and restrooms would minimize this impact.

Per section 3.5.1 Phase II excavation for the open channel construction is "approximately 25,500 cy "*. The typical truck for this type of excavation carries approximately 10 cy that is approximately 2550 truck trips. The volume of displaced soil for a parallel culvert is approximately 4200 cy (based on a 9'x14' outside dimension box culvert) or approximately 420 truck trips to export the material required for the parallel culvert. The parallel culvert export, truck trips and thus noise impact is 20% less than that of the open channel.

* based on a 100' wide channel 14' deep by 1000' long it could be as high as 30,000 cy or 2580 more truck trips than the culvert construction.

The open channel requires the relocation of the existing softball field and will require grading operations from the open channel north to Eliot Street. The parallel culvert construction zone could be done within a 150' zone of the existing culvert. Total disturbed area would be 1/3 to 1/2 that required for the open channel and softball field

reconstruction. The remaining area of the park, during culvert construction, would be available for community use.

Demolition of existing restrooms will not be required with PC.

Bridges will not be required with PC.

If the viewing platform is eliminated or redesigned to be floating, pile driving equipment will be minimized if not completely eliminated from the project. "Pile driving will be the noisiest activity on site" minimizing this activity will have achieved the greatest reduction in construction impact.

On-site Preschool

The dredging operations are unavoidable in the restoration effort because removal of the toxic silt is imperative to the restoration effort. However Colorado Street bridge construction will occur within 315' of the preschool and will have duration of approximately six months, according to Section 3.5.1. Section 4.9.5 states "The preschool shall be closed whenever construction or pile driving would occur within 315 and 706 feet, respectively". Given those two statements from the EIR the preschool/model boat shop **will be closed** the entire six month duration plus whatever duration is required for the dredging.

The entire parallel culvert construction could be completed in less than two months. The duration of construction within the 315' preschool/model boat shop zone is dramatically reduced with the parallel culvert. Pile driving will not be required for the parallel culvert construction.

Lagoon/Marina Vista park

SARANTOS, STEVEN

to:

Eric.Lopez

09/08/2010 11:44 AM

Show Details

Mr. Lopez-

As a father of two(ages 12 & 9) who walk & ride to Lowell/Rogers each day, a Del Lago resident and avid user of Marina Vista Park I strongly support improving the health of the Colorado Lagoon with the parallel culvert and NOT an open channel. Removing acres of beautiful and active park space when a viable option of a parallel culvert exists is not in the best interest of East Long Beach. I am opposed to an open channel through Marina Vista Park.

Regards,

Steve Sarantos

5732 Malaga Place

Steve Sarantos | SVP/Director of Sales | Christal Radio- LA

(O) 323.966.5078 | (M) 917.572.4658 | (F) 917.206.9665

Email: steve.sarantos@christal-radio.com

steve.sarantos@katzradiogroup.com

Colorado Lagoon and Marina Vista
Nancy McDowell
to:
gary.delong, eric.lopez, mark.sandoval
09/08/2010 12:59 PM
Show Details

Dear Sirs:

I know a decision has to be made soon about how waters will flow between the Lagoon and Marine Stadium. I am thrilled that the result will make the lagoon much cleaner. Wouldn't it be great if we could all swim in a clean lagoon! I know that different methods to accomplish this are being debated. I beg of you to not take any space from the Marine Vista Park. As a parent and coach of both little league and Soccer, I know first hand of our limited park space. One can drive by the park on almost any afternoon and weekend and observe the abundance of sports that are being played by both youth and adults. As we all know, a cricket league has taken up residence there in the last couple of years, which have pushed other sports closer to the softball field. Among the sports that I have observed in this park (and participated in) on a regular basis are: youth football, youth soccer, little league, AYSO and club soccer, and lacrosse. The adults use the parks for: soccer, football, rugby, cricket, baseball/softball and volleyball. Of course there are also picnics and what appear to be birthday parties in other parts of the park almost every weekend of the year.

Bottom line - WE NEED THE PARK SPACE, IT IS USED! Please do not elect to put in an open channel at the expense of the open park space. I stongly favor cleaning out the current culvert, and if necessary, installing a second culvert.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

Nancy McDowell (and family of 5)
512 Santiago Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90814



Marina Vista
Eric Bond to: Eric.Lopez

09/08/2010 01:12 PM

To Whom it may concern,

I support improving the health of the Colorado Lagoon with the parallel culvert. I am opposed to an open channel through Marina Vista Park.

Sincerely,

Eric Bond
1815 Litchfield
Long Beach CA 90815

--

ÐŸà;±á

Marina Vista Park

Brenda Donnelly

to:

Gary.Delong, Eric.Lopez, Mark.Sandoval

09/08/2010 02:39 PM

Show Details

To Whom it may concern,

I support improving the health of the Colorado Lagoon and await to see the results of cleaning the existing culvert in Phase I. I support improving the health of the Colorado Lagoon with the parallel culvert. I am opposed to an open channel through Marina Vista Park.

Sincerely,

Brenda Donnelly

2103 Lees Ave, Long Beach CA 90815

Voice your opinion to not see 3000 feet of fencing and 1 year of construction

Erik Bakker

to:

Gary.Delong, Eric.Lopez, Mark.Sandoval

09/08/2010 03:33 PM

Show Details

To Whom it may concern,

I support improving the health of the Colorado Lagoon with the parallel culvert. I am opposed to an open channel through Marina Vista Park.

Sincerely,

Name Erik Bakker

Address 267 Nieto Ave. Long Beach, CA 90803

Bcc recipients:

Just replace my name and address with yours and send. There is a meeting at LBYC tomorrow at 2:30. Ask real questions about fencing and safety and construction costs and road closures. Demand answers, this has been evaluated for years and tax payers have paid hundreds of thousands of dollars to get questions answered.

Colorado Lagoon
Hano, Ryan W (AS)

to:

Gary.Delong, Eric.Lopez, Mark.Sandoval

09/08/2010 04:33 PM

Show Details

To Whom it may concern,

I support improving the health of the Colorado Lagoon with the parallel culvert. I am opposed to an open channel through Marina Vista Park.

Sincerely,

Ryan Hano

5917 East Pacific Coast Highway #4

Long Beach, CA 90803

PATTIANNE NAGLE PARKER
4633 E 4th Street
Long Beach CA 90814-3074
pattiannen@yahoo.com
562-621-9247

August 28, 2010

Mayor Bob Foster
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Blvd., 14th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

RE: Support of the Colorado Lagoon Wetlands Restoration Project

Dear Mr. Mayor: *Lopez*

The Board of the Belmont Heights Community Association (BHCA) strongly supports the Colorado Lagoon Wetlands Restoration Project. Specifically, the Board supports the position of the Friends of the Colorado Lagoon (FOCL), as well as many members of the community at large, in calling for an open channel approach for phase two of the project, referred to as option 4a in the City's Planning documents.

As you know, the Colorado Lagoon is one of the last surviving vestiges of coastal wetlands habitat in Long Beach. According to FOCL, 98% of the Salt Marsh Habitat within the Lost Cerritos Wetlands, the terminus of the San Gabriel River Watershed, has been destroyed. While this project is small in terms of acreage restored, it must be considered in the context of the scarcity of coastal wetlands in Los Angeles County, where less than 5 percent of this ecosystem's historic acreage remains undeveloped. The project will create upland and transitional habitat that does not exist in the County, and restore healthy intertidal habitat that is also very sparse. Restoring an urban lagoon / wetland is critical to educating people about our vital interdependency with nature.


Furthermore, Colorado Lagoon is ranked as one of the most polluted beaches in California. Closures of the Lagoon due to unacceptable bacteria levels are increasingly frequent. Wildlife diversity has also suffered because of the accumulation of pollutants. In fact, the most polluted areas of the Lagoon have markedly fewer species and numbers of fish, invertebrate, and wetland plants and animals. Without question, tidal flow into the Lagoon is critical to improving water quality and the attenuated benefits of such.

There has been much discussion in the community about what approach should be taken to increase flow to the Lagoon. After listening to those who have researched the issue, the open channel approach offers the most effective long-term approach. Furthermore, it has been determined that restoring the Lagoon through the open channel option dramatically increases the chances of securing funding to complete the work. Although an open channel approach may be more expensive to construct, it is

one of the least expensive options regarding long-term maintenance.

In summary, the board of the BHCA strongly supports an open channel option, specifically 4a, for the second phase of the Colorado Lagoon restoration project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Pattianne Nagle Parker". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Pattianne" being the most prominent.

Pattianne Nagle Parker

Member
Belmont Heights Community Association

cc: Gary DeLong, Councilman, 3rd District ✓
Eric Lopez, Analyst, Property Services Bureau, Department of Community
Development

Colorado Lagoon & Marina Vista Park

Mark Michaels

to:

Gary.Delong, Eric.Lopez, Mark.Sandoval

09/08/2010 08:17 PM

Show Details

Gentlemen,

I support utilizing a parallel culvert to improve the Colorado Lagoon water quality. I oppose any open channel through Marina Vista Park.

I am writing to express my desire to have the Colorado Lagoon water quality improved, and to do so without destroying an important, unique and irreplaceable asset to our community...Marina Vista Park. The project to improve the water quality to the Colorado Lagoon has moved forward with several alternative plans being considered. The engineering studies conducted to date have found that ALL alternatives improve the quality of the water through tidal flow EQUALLY WELL. Despite this, and that the project was never intended to go beyond the scope of water and habitat improvement of the Lagoon, other alternatives are being considered which add wildlife areas in adjacent areas not remotely involved with the Lagoon. This would be a great detriment to the community. The amount of new wildlife areas is minimal compared to the large area that already exists around the Lagoon itself. Moreover, following any plan that destroys existing and important recreation areas, which are not replaceable and have NO EQUIVALENT in the area, is not beneficial to the community. Most importantly, the only goal of the project can be fully accomplished without the need to destroy any existing facilities.

In addition to the above listed concerns, there remains substantial questions about the thoroughness of the previously conducted studies, both regarding cost and also regarding construction and post-construction requirements that were not considered. A recent analysis completed by a physical engineer, Matthew Kirk, demonstrates some of the shortcomings of the previously conducted studies.

In sum, I support the efforts to improve the water quality of the Lagoon. Doing so can be fully accomplished through the use of culverts, without the need to destroy Marina Vista Park. Utilizing culverts is also a more cost-effective means of improving water quality. I ask that you oppose the use of any open channel, and endorse the use of culverts in the final design of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark H. Michaels, Ph.D.

Open Channel - Marina Vista Park - Lack of Outreach to the City

Craig Wallace

to:

'Gary DeLong', eric.lopez, Mark.Sandoval

09/09/2010 08:41 PM

Cc:

ryan, EricP, LBReport, district1, district4, district5, dee.andrews, district7, district8, district9, "Matt Kirk"

Show Details

Mr. DeLong,

I find it unfortunate that the City, and You having given support to the Open Channel with out properly informing the Public. The majority of the people in the 3rd District do not know exactly how big the Channel will be, and the impact it will have on Park Activities, including Thursday Night Summer Concerts at Marine Stadium.

I feel the City should actually "stake out ", install "story poles" or, install Orange Construction Fence, to provide a visual representation of the proposed channel. This will serve as a tool to assist the public, city staff and engineers, as to the actual size and impact the proposed channel would have.

There should be a Sign explaining exactly what is being proposed, and allow the Community to Comment on it.

This should be left in place for a minimum of 6 weeks.

The destruction of active park space impacts residents from all over the city, not just the Third District. This will be a major alteration to a PUBLIC PARK. It will also act as a divider of neighborhoods.

If the City, You and FOCL feel so strongly that the community is behind you, then this should be a good idea.

I feel the out reach has been poor to the General Public. There are thousands of people that live there life and drive by Marina Vista Park daily, and have not heard one thing about this.

The City should provide outreach for comments by actually showing how big this will be.

Anything less then this shows a lack of transparency by the City of Long Beach and a general lack of concern and for the majority of the residents of Long Beach.

DO THE RIGHT THING, AND LAY THIS OUT IN THE PARK FOR ALL TO SEE!

Craig Wallace

**Wallace Real Estate Services
Residential & Commercial Appraisals**



wallace real estate services
Appraisals

"Covering Southern California's Real Estate Needs"

www.WallaceRES.com

p 562.673.1138

f 562.494.6577