Item	Name	E-mail	Street	Neighborhood	City	State	Zip	Comment	Received
HEARINGS:	Cheryl Perry	perry351@charter.net				CA		I am supportive of an active Civic Center but I have 3 concerns: a. The estimated increased costs that will have to come out of the General Fund b. The inadequate mitigation for the loss of a cultural resource (per the EIR) c. The limited library space for the retention of historical records	12/15/2015
(15-1312) 4. Declare ordinance (i) finding and determining that a Transportation Improvement Fee (TIF) credit is due for the Project in accordance with Section 18.17.110 of the Long Beach Municipal Code; and (ii) authorizing City Manager to execute an agreement providing for a TIF credit read the first time and laid over to the next regular meeting of the City Council for final reading;	Regina Taylor	regina17@verizon.net			Long Beach	CA	90806	What is being given up in terms of public safety and quality of life services to pay for this pricey project. I am not opposed to City Hall improvements but this is a 40 year commitment at $15M per year without a definite cap (can increase for "other reasons"??) Has this project and its costs beeen thoroughly analyzed by a disinterested party (emphasis on disinterested) and full disclosure made? Future generations willl not thank us for this one if we proceed as it stands.	12/15/2015

Item	Name	E-mail	Street	Neighborhood	City	State	Zip	Comment	Received
(15-1313) 14. Declare Proposition "L" ordinance read the first time and laid over to the next regular meeting of the City Council for final reading, which, pursuant to Section 1806 of the City Charter, makes findings and determinations regarding contracting of custodial, maintenance and security services; 15. Authorize City Manager to execute an amendment to Contract No. 33344 with Arup North America Limited in the amount of $3,376,299 for the City to change management, Project and contract management, commissioning and relocation services; and an additional $652,996 for the Port, should the Port decide to proceed and, if so, to reimburse the City,	Laurie Angel	lcangel@charter.net		North Long Beach	Long Beach	CA	90805	Part of the appropriation increase of $28.49M includes $18.78M added construction costs of which $8.39 coming from 'various funds available'. Where are those funds coming from specifically and what is NOT getting done, nor funded because of this fund diversion? Other cost adjustments must be expected. How prudent are these funding choices when the city budget is so tight and we are down over 225 police officers? Maybe downsize or phase the project to something the city can afford?	12/15/2015

Item	Name	E-mail	Street	Neighborhood	City	State	Zip	Comment	Received
2. (15-1305) Recommendation to receive supporting documentation into the record and conclude the hearing regarding the issuance of the Finance Authority of Long Beach (FALB) Lease Revenue Bonds, adopt resolution approving the proceedings by the FALB for the issuance of 2016 Lease Revenue Bonds Series A in a total amount not to exceed $14,500,000, to finance the hazardous materials abatement and demolition of the former County of Los Angeles Courthouse, a storm drain relocation project, and a portion of the costs of the Civic Center project, and approving related documents and actions; Increase appropriation in the General Fund (GF) in the Citywide Activities Department	Laurie Angel	lcangel@charter.net		North Long Beach	Long Beach	CA	90805	The annual debt service is funded $965K FOR the Civic Ctr Proj & the balance FOR other projects funded by RDA RESIDUAL prop taxes. So that for next 10 yrs RESIDUAL RDA funds that had a very specific purpose, need & use will now be diverted to pay for courthouse demo and the Civic Ctr?? The agenda items does not reveal what projects throughout the city will no longer be funded. What is the trade off to the city & community? Suggest phase the new Civic Ctr & wait for RDA loan to the city.	12/15/2015

Item	Name	E-mail	Street	Neighborhood	City	State	Zip	Comment	Received
3. 15-1295 Recommendation to conduct a study session to receive and discuss the City's capital investment needs for transportation infrastructure and City facilities. (Citywide)	Laurie Angel	lcangel@charter.net		North Long Beach	Long Beach	CA	90805	The capital transportation infrastructure requirements of this city are extensive. Rather than focusing on addressing these over arching needs the council is voting for additional indebtedness & handing over tens of millions to build a civic center complex. Timing is everything. The civic center does not all have to be done now. Given the city's demands on cash & the serious need for improved services & safety for the community an important shift in duty and responsibility should be addressed.	12/15/2015

Item	Name	E-mail	Street	Neighborhood	City	State	Zip	Comment	Received
14. (15-1248) Recommendation to respectfully request City Council approval of the 2016 State Legislative Agenda as recommended by the State Legislation Committee.	Laurie Angel	lcangel@charter.net		North Long Beach	Long Beach	CA	90805	'A 3rd new focus is coordinating with DOF to secure timely approval of property sales' - Expediency must not trump quality of life and the importance of specific uses and development and most importantly how that development and use relates to the surrounding area. Ensure the best interests of the community are at heart, not satisfying the DOF. Land use is one of the most important elements for your consideration because of long term impacts to the community otherwise.	12/15/2015

Item	Name	E-mail	Street	Neighborhood	City	State	Zip	Comment	Received
PUBLIC COMMENT:	Laurie Angel	lcangel@charter.net		North Long Beach	Long Beach	CA	90805	The recent new zoning designation to allow for Planned Unit Developments (PUDs)must be reviewed. Its major flaw is that is does not adequately consider the development in the context of the area in which it exists. An EIR may attempt to incidentally address some of the issues, but does not adequately protect the surrounding community from the force of significant impacts. Any development that adversely impacts the day to day quality of life of the immediate community must be reconsidered.	12/15/2015